arXiv:1208.4139v3 [math.NT] 15 Sep 2012

MATRIX COEFFICIENTS AND EFFECTIVE COUNTING FOR GEOMETRICALLY FINITE GROUPS

AMIR MOHAMMADI AND HEE OH

Abstract. For $G := \mathrm{SO}(n,1)^\circ$ and $\Gamma < G$ a geometrically finite subgroup with critical exponent bigger than $(n-1)/2$, we obtain an *effective* archimedean counting result for a discrete orbit of Γ in a homogeneous space $H\backslash G$ where H is the trivial group, an affine symmetric subgroup or a horospherical subgroup. More precisely, for an explicit measure $\mathcal{M}$ on $H\backslash G$ which depends on Γ, we show that for any family $\{\mathcal{B}_T\}$ of compact subsets in $H\backslash G$, which is effectively well-rounded with respect to Γ, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\#[e]\Gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T = \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta}).$$

When Γ is contained in an arithmetic subgroup of G, coupled with the recent developments on the super-strong approximation property of Γ, the uniform effectiveness of our counting results over congruence subgroups of Γ yields sharp upper bounds for primes and lower bounds for almost primes in the affine sieve on orbits of Γ.

One of key ingredients in our approach is an effective asymptotic formula for the matrix coefficients of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ that we prove by combining methods from spectral analysis, harmonic analysis and ergodic theory. An effective mixing for the Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure is also obtained as an application of our methods.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Matrix coefficients in $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ by ergodic methods 10
3. Asymptotic expansion of Matrix coefficients 11
4. Non-wandering component of $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H a_t$ as $t \to \infty$ 23
5. Translates of a compact piece of $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ via thickening 26
6. Distribution of $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H a_t$ and Transversal intersections 31
7. Effective uniform counting 40
8. Affine sieve 50
References 53

The authors are supported in part by NSF grants.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be the identity component of the special orthogonal group $\mathrm{SO}(n,1)$ for $n \geq 2$, which can also be thought as the group $\mathrm{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^n)$ of orientation preserving isometries of the hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^n$. A discrete subgroup Γ of G is called *geometrically finite* if the unit neighborhood of its convex core[1] has finite Riemannian volume. As any discrete group admitting a finite sided polyhedron as a fundamental domain in $\mathbb{H}^n$ is geometrically finite, this class of discrete subgroups provides a natural generalization of lattices in G. In particular, for $n = 2$, a discrete subgroup of G is geometrically finite if and only if it is finitely generated.

For a geometrically finite group Γ of G, we consider its action by right translations on the homogeneous space $H\backslash G$, where H is the trivial group, an affine symmetric subgroup or a horospherical subgroup. The main aim of this paper is to obtain *effective* archimedean counting results for discrete orbits of Γ in $H\backslash G$, assuming that the critical exponent δ of Γ is strictly bigger than $(n-1)/2$. When Γ is contained in an arithmetic subgroup of G, using a recent result of Salehi-Golsefidy and Varjú [51] on the super-strong approximation property of Γ, which is a generalization of an earlier work of Bourgain, Gamburd, Sarnak [5] for $n = 2$, we are able to formulate our effective counting results *uniformly* over all congruence subgroups of Γ of square-free moduli. Consequently we obtain sharp upper bounds in the affine sieve on Γ-orbits using an archimedean norm to order the elements.

For Γ lattices, i.e., when $\delta = n-1$, both the effective counting and its applications to an affine sieve have been extensively studied (see [14], [15], [3], [40], [19], [38], [44], [18], as well as survey articles [32], [33]). Hence our main focus is when Γ is of infinite co-volume in G.

We begin by describing an effective asymptotic result on the matrix coefficients for $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$, which is a key ingredient in our approach as well as of independent interest. When Γ is not a lattice, a well-known theorem of Howe and Moore [22] implies that for any $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$, the matrix coefficient

$$\langle a\Psi_1, \Psi_2\rangle := \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi_1(ga)\overline{\Psi_2(g)}dg$$

decays to zero as $a \in G$ tends to infinity (here dg is a G-invariant measure on $\Gamma\backslash G$). Describing the precise asymptotic is much more involved. Fix a Cartan decomposition $G = KAK$ where K is a maximal compact subgroup of G and A is a one-parameter subgroup of diagonalizable elements. Let M denote the centralizer of A in K. The quotient spaces G/K and G/M can be respectively identified with $\mathbb{H}^n$ and its unit tangent bundle $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$, and we parametrize $A = \{a_t : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ so that the right translation action of a_t in G/M corresponds to the geodesic flow on $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ for time t.

---

[1] The *convex core* $C_\Gamma \subset \Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^n$ of Γ is the image of the minimal convex subset of $\mathbb{H}^n$ which contains all geodesics connecting any two points in the limit set of Γ.

We let $\{m_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^n\}$ and $\{\nu_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^n\}$ be Γ-invariant conformal densities of dimensions $(n-1)$ and δ respectively, unique up to scalings. Let $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}, m^{\mathrm{BR}}, m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}$ and m^{Haar} denote, respectively, the Bowen-Margulis-Sullivan measure, the Burger-Roblin measures for the expanding and the contracting horospherical foliations, and the Liouville-measure on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^n)$, all defined with respect to the fixed pair $\{m_x\}$ and $\{\nu_x\}$ (see Def. 2.1). Using the identification $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^n) = \Gamma\backslash G/M$, we may extend these measures to M-invariant measures on $\Gamma\backslash G$, which we will denote by the same notation and call them the BMS, the BR, the BR_*, the Haar measures for simplicity. We note that for $\delta < n-1$, only the BMS measure has finite mass.

Throughout the introduction, we assume that $\delta > (n-1)/2$. By the works of Lax-Phillips [36] and Sullivan [55], this assumption on δ implies that the discrete spectrum of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^n)$ for the Laplacian consists of finitely many eigenvalues: $0 < \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 \le \cdots \le \alpha_k < (n-1)^2/4$ with $\alpha_0 = \delta(n-1-\delta)$. The difference $\alpha_1 - \alpha_0$ is called the spectral gap for Γ.

Theorem 1.1. *There exist $\eta_0 > 0$ (depending only on the spectral gap for Γ) and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any real-valued $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)$, as $t \to \infty$,*

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{\Gamma\backslash G}\Psi_1(ga_t)\Psi_2(g)\,dm^{\mathrm{Haar}}(g) = \frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_1)\cdot m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_2)e^{-\eta_0 t})$$

where $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_i)$ denotes the ℓ-th Sobolev L^2-norm of Ψ_i for each $i = 1, 2$.

The aforementioned result of Lax-Phillips and Sullivan, together with the classification of the unitary dual of G, implies that the minimal subrepresentation of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$, i.e., the irreducible subrepresentation whose matrix coefficients decay slowest, is the complementary series representation $\mathcal{H}_\delta$ corresponding to the parameter δ, i.e., its unique K-fixed vector is a Laplacian eigenfunction with eigenvalue $\delta(n-1-\delta)$. Therefore the main work is to understand the asymptotic of $\langle a_t P_\delta(\Psi_1), P_\delta(\Psi_2)\rangle$ where P_δ is the projection operator from $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ to $\mathcal{H}_\delta$. Building up on the work of Harish-Chandra on the asymptotic behavior of the Eisenstein integrals (cf. [58], [59]), we first obtain an asymptotic formula for $\langle a_t v, w\rangle$ for all K-isotypic vectors $v, w \in \mathcal{H}_\delta$. This extension alone does not explain the leading term of $\langle a_t P_\delta(\Psi_1), P_\delta(\Psi_2)\rangle$ in terms of functions Ψ_1 and Ψ_2; however, we are able to use an ergodic theorem of Roblin [49] to identify the main term as given in Theorem 1.1.

By Flaminio and Spatzier [16], the BMS measure m^{BMS} on $\Gamma\backslash G$ is mixing for a_t. We deduce the following effective mixing from Theorem 1.1: for a compact subset Ω of $\Gamma\backslash G$, we denote by $C^\infty(\Omega)$ the set of all smooth functions on $\Gamma\backslash G$ with support contained in Ω.

Theorem 1.2. *There exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any compact subset $\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash G$, and for any $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, as $t \to \infty$,*

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi_1(ga_t)\Psi_2(g)dm^{\mathrm{BMS}}(g) = \frac{m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi_1)\cdot m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_2)e^{-\eta_0 t})$$

where the implied constant depends only on Ω.

For Γ convex co-compact, Theorem 1.2 was known for any $\delta > 0$ by Stoyanov [54], based on the approach developed by Dolgopyat [13]; however when Γ has cusps and of infinite co-volume, this theorem seems to be new even for $n = 2$.

For the next theorem, let H be a horospherical subgroup or a symmetric subgroup of G: a symmetric subgroup is defined to be the group of all σ-fixed points in G for an involution σ of G. Any symmetric subgroup of G is known to be locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SO}(k,1)\times\mathrm{SO}(n-k)$ for some $0 \le k \le n-1$. For these groups, we can relate the asymptotic distribution of translates of the orbit $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ to the matrix coefficients of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$. We fix a generalized Cartan decomposition $G = HAK$. We parametrize $A = \{a_t\}$ as before, and for H horospherical, we will assume that H is the expanding horospherical subgroup for a_t.

Let μ_H^{Haar} be the H-invariant measure on $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ defined with respect to $\{m_x\}$, and recall the skinning measure μ_H^{PS} on $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ defined with respect to $\{\nu_x\}$, introduced in [46] (cf. (5.1)).

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ is closed and that $|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}| < \infty$. There exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any compact subset $\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash G$, any $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and any bounded $\phi \in C^\infty(\Gamma\cap H\backslash H)$, as $t \to \infty$,*

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{h\in\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H} \Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)d\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}}(h) = \frac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi)m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\cdot S_\ell(\phi)e^{-\eta_0 t})$$

with the implied constant depending only on Ω.

By [46], the finiteness of μ_H^{PS} is equivalent to the condition that δ is strictly bigger than the parabolic co-rank of Γ with respect to H (see Prop. 6.10). Letting $Y_\Omega := \{h \in (\Gamma\cap H)\backslash H : ha_t \in \Omega \text{ for some } t > 0\}$ for $\Omega = \mathrm{supp}(\Psi)$, note that $\int \Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)d\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}} = \int_{Y_\Omega}\Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)d\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}}$. In the case when μ_H^{PS} is compactly supported, Y_Ω turns out to be a compact set and in this case, the so-called thickening method ([15], [25]) is sufficient to deduce Theorem 1.3 from Theorem 1.1, using the wave front property of [15]. The case of μ_H^{PS} not compactly supported is much more intricate; though we obtain a thick-thin decomposition of Y_Ω with the thick part being compact and control both the Haar measure and the skinning measure of the thin part (Theorem 6.12), the usual method of thickening the thick part does not suffice, as the error term coming from the thin part overtakes the leading term; the main reason being that we are taking the integral with respect to μ_H^{Haar} as well as multiplying the weight factor $e^{(n-1-\delta)t}$ in the left hand side of Theorem 1.3, whereas the finiteness assumption is made on the skinning measure μ_H^{PS}. In this case, we proceed by comparing the two measures $(a_t)_*\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}$ and $(a_t)_*\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}}$ via the the transversal intersections of the orbits $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H a_t$ with the weak-stable horospherical foliations. This approach goes back to [49], [52] and was also one of the main tools in [46].

In the special case of $n = 2, 3$ and H horospherical, Theorem 1.3 was proved in [37] by a different method.

Assuming that the orbit $[e]\Gamma$ is discrete in $H\backslash G$, Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 are key ingredients in understanding the asymptotic of the number $\#([e]\Gamma\cap\mathcal{B}_T)$ for a given family $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset H\backslash G\}$ of growing compact subsets, as observed in [14].

For H horospherical or symmetric, we have $G = HA^+K$ or $G = HA^+K\cup HA^-K$ (as a disjoint union except for the identity element) where $A^\pm = \{a_{\pm t} : t \ge 0\}$.

Definition 1.4. Define a Borel measure $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}$ on $H\backslash G$ as follows: for $\psi \in C_c(H\backslash G)$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\psi) = \begin{cases} \frac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\int_{a_t k\in A^+K} \psi([e]a_t k)e^{\delta t}dt d\nu_o(k^{-1}) & \text{if } G = HA^+K \\ \sum \frac{|\mu_{H,\pm}^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\int_{a_{\pm t} k\in A^\pm K} \psi([e]a_{\pm t} k)e^{\delta t}dt d\nu_o(k^{-1}) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $o \in \mathbb{H}^n$ is the point fixed by K, ν_o is the right M-invariant measure on K, which projects to the PS-measure ν_o on $K/M = \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ and $\mu_{H,-}^{\mathrm{PS}}$ is the skinning measure on $\Gamma\cap H\backslash H$ in the negative direction, as defined in (6.18).

Definition 1.5. Let H be the trivial group $\{e\}$. Define a Borel measure $\mathcal{M}_G$ on G as follows: for $\psi \in C_c(G)$,

$$\mathcal{M}_G(\psi) = \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\int_{k_1 a_t k_2\in KA^+K} \psi(k_1 a_t k_2)e^{\delta t}d\nu_o(k_1)dt d\nu_o(k_2^{-1}).$$

Observe that the measure $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}$ depends on Γ, unless Γ is a lattice.

Definition 1.6. For a family $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset H\backslash G\}$ of compact subsets with $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)$ tending to infinity as $T\to\infty$, we say that $\{\mathcal{B}_T\}$ is *effectively well-rounded with respect to* Γ if there exists $p > 0$ such that for all small $\epsilon > 0$ and $T \gg 1$:

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^+ - \mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^-) = O(\epsilon^p)\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^+ = G_\epsilon\mathcal{B}_T G_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^- = \cap_{g_1,g_2\in G_\epsilon} g_1\mathcal{B}_T g_2$ if $H = \{e\}$; and $\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^+ = \mathcal{B}_T G_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^- = \cap_{g\in G_\epsilon}\mathcal{B}_T g$ if H is horospherical or symmetric. Here G_ϵ

denote a symmetric ϵ-neighborhood of e in G with respect to a left invariant Riemannian metric on G.

Since any two left-invariant Riemannian metrics on G are Lipschitz equivalent to each other, the above definition is independent of the choice of a Riemannian metric.

Norm balls as well as many natural families of sectors are indeed effectively well-rounded (see Propositions 7.7, 7.10 and 7.12).

Note that if Γ is a lattice, then $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}$ is the leading term of an invariant measure and hence this definition of the effective well-roundedness for Γ is equivalent to that of [3], which is an effective version of the well-roundedness condition given in [15]. In such a case, the effective well-roundedness of $\mathcal{B}_T$ implies that if $H \cap \Gamma$ is a lattice in H, there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that as $T \to \infty$,

$$\#([e]\Gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T) = \mathrm{Vol}(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\mathrm{Vol}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta_0})$$

where Vol is computed with respect to a suitably normalized invariant measure on $H\backslash G$ (cf. [14], [15], [40], [18], [3]).

Hence the following theorem presents its generalization, stated in a form suitable for our intended application to an affine sieve: let $\{\Gamma_d < \Gamma : d \in I\}$ be a family of finite index subgroups such that $\Gamma_d \cap H = \Gamma \cap H$. We say $\{\Gamma_d\}$ has a uniform spectral gap if there is a uniform positive lower bound for the spectral gap of all Γ_d's.

Theorem 1.7. *Suppose that $\{\Gamma_d\}$ possesses a uniform spectral gap. Let H be the trivial group, a horospherical subgroup or a symmetric subgroup. When H is symmetric, we also assume that $|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}| < \infty$. If $\{\mathcal{B}_T\}$ is effectively well-rounded with respect to Γ, then there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ such that for any $d \in I$ and for any $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$,*

$$\#([e]\Gamma_d\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T) = \tfrac{1}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_d]}\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta_0})$$

with the implied constant independent of Γ_d and $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$.

Recalling any symmetric subgroup H is locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SO}(k,1) \times \mathrm{SO}(n-k)$, it follows from [46, Lem. 1.13] and our assumption of $\delta > \frac{n-1}{2}$ that if $k \geq \frac{n+1}{2}$, then $|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}| < \infty$.

In Corollaries 7.11 and 7.13, we have applied Theorem 1.7 to sectors and norm balls.

We also formulate our counting statements for bisectors in the HAK decomposition, motivated by recent applications in [7] and [8] for $n = 2, 3$. Let $\tau_1 \in C_c^\infty(H)$ and $\tau_2 \in C^\infty(K)$, and define $\xi_T^{\tau_1,\tau_2} \in C^\infty(G)$ as follows: for $g = hak \in HA^+K$,

$$\xi_T^{\tau_1,\tau_2}(g) = \chi_{A_T^+}(a) \cdot \int_{H\cap M} \tau_1(hm)\tau_2(m^{-1}k)dm$$

where $\chi_{A_T^+}$ denotes the characteristic function of $A_T^+ = \{a_t : 0 < t < \log T\}$ and $d_{H\cap M}$ is the probability Haar measure of $H \cap M$. Since if $hak = h'ak'$, then $h = h'm$ and $k = m^{-1}k'$ for some $m \in H \cap M$, $\xi_T^{\tau_1,\tau_2}$ is well-defined.

Theorem 1.8. *If $\{\Gamma_d\}$ possesses a uniform spectral gap, then there exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any compact subset H_0 of H which injects to $\Gamma\backslash G$, any $\tau_1 \in C^\infty(H_0)$, $\tau_2 \in C^\infty(K)$, any $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$ and any $d \in I$,*

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_d\gamma_0} \xi_T^{\tau_1,\tau_2}(\gamma) = \frac{\tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)\cdot \nu_o^*(\tau_2)}{\delta \cdot [\Gamma : \Gamma_d]\cdot |m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} T^\delta + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2)T^{\delta-\eta_0})$$

where $\nu_o^*(\tau_2) = \int_K \tau_2(k) d\nu_o(k^{-1})$ and $\tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}$ is the skinning measure on H with respect to Γ and the implied constant depends only on Γ and H_0.

The degree ℓ in the Sobolev norms $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_i)$ in Theorem 1.8 depends only on K (more precisely, the rank and the number of roots of K so that (3.31) holds) and the dimensions of H, K, G so that $\mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)$ holds for all smooth functions Ψ on these groups with supports in fixed compact subsets.

Theorem 1.8 also holds for characteristic functions satisfying what we call an admissibility condition (see Corollary 7.17 and Proposition 7.7).

We remark that unless $H = K$, Corollary 7.11, which is a special case of Theorem 1.7 for sectors in $H\backslash G$, does not follow from Theorem 1.8, as the latter deals only with compactly supported functions τ_1. For $H = K$, Theorem 1.8 was earlier shown in [6] for $n = 2$ and in [57] for $n = 3$.

Remark 1.9. Noneffective versions of Theorems 1.3, 1.7, and 1.8 were obtained in [46] for a more general class of discrete groups, that is, any non-elementary discrete subgroup admitting finite BMS-measure.

Generalizing the counting results for Apollonian circle packings [30], the asymptotic for the number of circles of curvature at most T, intersecting a bounded region E, in a circle packing in the plane invariant under a geometrically finite group Γ has been obtained in [47], via translating the counting problem into the counting for $[e]\Gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T(E)$ for a suitably defined subset $\mathcal{B}_T(E) \subset \mathrm{SO}(n-1,1)\backslash \mathrm{SO}(n,1)$, $n = 3$. Theorem 1.7 now provides an effective version of the counting theorems in [47] (as well as its higher dimensional analogues for sphere packings discussed in [45]) provided the critical exponent of Γ is bigger than $(n-1)/2$ and E is sufficiently regular so that $\mathcal{B}_T(E)$ is effectively well-rounded.

One of the most exciting applications of Theorem 1.7 can be found in connection with Diophantine problems on orbits of Γ. Let $\mathbf{G}$ be a special orthogonal group defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ in $n+1$ variable which has signature $(n, 1)$, and set $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})^\circ$. Let $\mathbf{G}$ act on an affine space V via a $\mathbb{Q}$-rational representation in a way that $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z})$ preserves $V(\mathbb{Z})$. Fix a non-zero vector $w_0 \in V(\mathbb{Z})$ and denote by $\mathbf{H}$ its stabilizer subgroup and set $H = \mathbf{H}(\mathbb{R})$. We consider one of the following situations: (1) $w_0\mathbf{G}$ is Zariski closed and H is a symmetric subgroup of G or the trivial subgroup; (2) $w_0\mathbf{G} \cup \{0\}$ is Zariski closed and H is a compact extension of a horospherical subgroup of G.

If H is symmetric, we assume that $|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}| < \infty$. Let Γ be a geometrically finite subgroup of G with $\delta > (n-1)/2$, which is contained in $\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{Z})$. Let

F be an integer-valued polynomial on the orbit $w_0\Gamma$. Salehi-Golsefidy and Sarnak [50], generalizing [5], showed that for some $R > 1$, the set of $\mathbf{x} \in w_0\Gamma$ with $F(\mathbf{x})$ having at most R prime factors is Zariski dense in w_0G. The following is a quantitative version: let F be weakly primitive, i.e., $\gcd\{F(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in w_0\Gamma\}$ is 1. Letting $F = F_1F_2\cdots F_r$ be a factorization into irreducible polynomials, assume that all F_j's are integral on $w_0\Gamma$.

Theorem 1.10 (Upper bound for primes)**.** *Let $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset w_0G : T \gg 1\}$ be an effectively well-rounded family of subsets with respect to Γ. Then for all $T \gg 1$,*

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in w_0\Gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T : F_j(\mathbf{x}) \text{ is prime for } j = 1, \cdots, r\} \ll \frac{\mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T)}{(\log \mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T))^r}.$$

Theorem 1.11 (Lower bound for almost primes)**.** *Let $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset w_0G : T \gg 1\}$ be an effectively well-rounded family of subsets with respect to Γ. Assume further that $\max_{x\in\mathcal{B}_T} \|x\| \ll \mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^\beta$ for some $\beta > 0$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is any norm on V. Then there exists $R = R(F, w_0\Gamma, \beta) \geq 1$ such that for all $T \gg 1$,*

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in w_0\Gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T : F(\mathbf{x}) \text{ has at most } R \text{ prime factors}\} \gg \frac{\mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T)}{(\log \mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T))^r}.$$

For instance, Theorems 1.10 and 1.11 can be applied to the norm balls $\mathcal{B}_T = \{\mathbf{x} \in w_0G : \|\mathbf{x}\| < T\}$ and in this case $\mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T) \asymp T^{\delta/\lambda}$ where λ denotes the log of the largest eigenvalue of a_1 on the $\mathbb{R}$-span of w_0G.[2].

In order to present a concrete example, we consider an integral quadratic form $Q(x_1, \cdots, x_{n+1})$ of signature $(n, 1)$ and for an integer $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, denote by $W_{Q,s}$ the affine quadric given by

$$\{\mathbf{x} : Q(\mathbf{x}) = s\}.$$

As well-known, $W_{Q,s}$ is a one-sheeted hyperboloid if $s > 0$, a two-sheeted hyperboloid if $s < 0$ and a cone if $s = 0$. We will assume that $Q(\mathbf{x}) = s$ has a non-zero integral solution, so pick $w_0 \in W_{Q,s}(\mathbb{Z})$. If $s \neq 0$, the stabilizer subgroup G_{w_0} is symmetric; more precisely, locally isomorphic to $\mathrm{SO}(n-1, 1)$ (if $s > 0$) or $\mathrm{SO}(n)$ (if $s < 0$) and if $s = 0$, G_{w_0} is a compact extension of a horospherical subgroup. By the remark following Theorem 1.7, the skinning measure $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{G_{w_0}}$ is finite if $n \geq 3$. For $n = 2$ and $s > 0$, G_{w_0} is a one-dimensional subgroup consisting of diagonalizable elements, and $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{G_{w_0}}$ is infinite only when the geodesic in $\mathbb{H}^2$ stabilized by G_{w_0} is divergent and goes into a cusp of a fundamental domain of Γ in $\mathbb{H}^2$; in this case, we call w_0 externally Γ-parabolic, following [46]. We also note that $\max_{x\in\mathcal{B}_T} \|x\| = T \ll \mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1/\delta}$ in this case. Therefore the following are special cases of Theorems 1.10 and 1.11:

---

[2] $f(T) \asymp g(T)$ means that their ratio is between two positive uniform constants for all $T > 1$.

Corollary 1.12. *Let Γ be a geometrically finite group contained in $\mathrm{SO}_Q(\mathbb{Z})$ with $\delta > \frac{n-1}{2}$. In the case when $n = 2$ and $s > 0$, we additionally assume that w_0 is not externally Γ-parabolic. Fixing a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$, we have, for any $1 \le r \le n+1$,*

1. $\{\mathbf{x} \in w_0\Gamma : \|\mathbf{x}\| < T,\ \ x_j$ *is prime for all* $j = 1, \cdots, r\} \ll \frac{T^\delta}{(\log T)^r}$;
2. *for some* $R > 1$,

$$\{\mathbf{x} \in w_0\Gamma : \|\mathbf{x}\| < T,\ x_1 \cdots x_r \text{ has at most } R \text{ prime factors}\} \gg \frac{T^\delta}{(\log T)^r}.$$

The above upper bound in (1) is sharp up to a multiplicative constant. The lower bound in (2) can also be stated for admissible sectors (cf. Corollary 7.13), which then implies a certain uniform distribution of almost prime vectors. Corollary 1.12 was obtained in cases when $n = 2, 3$ and $s \le 0$ ([4], [28], [30],[29], [37]).

To explain how Theorems 1.10 and 1.11 follow from Theorem 1.7, let $\Gamma_d = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : w_0\gamma = w_0 \mod (\mathrm{d})\}$ for each square-free integer d. Then $\mathrm{Stab}_{\Gamma_d}(w_0) = \mathrm{Stab}_\Gamma(w_0)$. The work of Salehi-Golsefidy and Varjú [51] on the uniform expansion property of $\{\Gamma/\Gamma_d :\ d$ square-free$\}$ (also called the super-strong approximation property), generalizing the work of Bourgain, Gamburd and Sarnak [5] for $n = 2$, implies that the family $\{\Gamma_d :\ d$ square-free$\}$ has a uniform spectral gap; the transfer property from the combinatorial spectral gap to archimedean one was established in [4] (see also [26]). Hence Theorem 1.7 holds for this congruence family $\{\Gamma_d : d$: square-free$\}$, providing a key axiomatic condition in executing the combinatorial sieve (see [24, 6.1-6.4], [23, Theorem 7.4], as well as [5, Sec. 3]). Provided that an explicit uniform spectral gap for $\{\Gamma_d\}$ is known (e.g., [17], [39]), the number $R(F, w_0\Gamma)$ can also be explicitly computed.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we recall the ergodic result of Roblin which gives the leading term of the matrix coefficients for $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$. In section 3, we obtain an effective asymptotic expansion for the matrix coefficients of the complementary series representations of G (Theorem 3.24) as well as for those of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$, proving Theorem 1.1. In section 4, we study the reduction theory for the non-wandering component of $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H a_t$, describing its thick-thin decomposition; this is needed as $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ has infinite volume in general. We will see that the non-trivial dynamics of $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H a_t$ as $t \to \infty$ can be seen only within a subset of finite PS-measure. In section 5, for ϕ compactly supported, we prove Theorem 1.3 using Theorem 1.1 via thickening. For general bounded ϕ, Theorem 1.3 is obtained via a careful study of the transversal intersections in section 6 in which Theorem 1.2 is also proved. Counting theorems 1.7 and 1.8 are proved in section 7 and Sieve theorems 1.10 and 1.11 are proved in the final section 8.

Acknowledgment: We are very grateful to Peter Sarnak for several helpful comments on the preliminary version of this paper. We would like to thank

Sigurdur Helgason for the reference on the work of Harish-Chandra. We also thank Dale Winter for helpful conversations on the topic.

2. Matrix coefficients in $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ by ergodic methods

Throughout the paper, let G be $\mathrm{SO}(n,1)^\circ = \mathrm{Isom}^+(\mathbb{H}^n)$ for $n \ge 2$, i.e., the group of orientation preserving isometries of $\mathbb{H}^n$, and $\Gamma < G$ be a non-elementary torsion-free geometrically finite group. Let $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ denote the geometric boundary of $\mathbb{H}^n$. Let $\Lambda(\Gamma) \subset \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ denote the limit set of Γ, and δ the critical exponent of Γ, which is known to be equal to the Hausdorff dimension of $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ [56].

A family of measures $\{\mu_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^n\}$ is called a Γ-*invariant conformal density* of dimension $\delta_\mu > 0$ on $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$, if each μ_x is a non-zero finite Borel measure on $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ satisfying for any $x, y \in \mathbb{H}^n$, $\xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$,

$$\gamma_*\mu_x = \mu_{\gamma x} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d\mu_y}{d\mu_x}(\xi) = e^{-\delta_\mu \beta_\xi(y,x)},$$

where $\gamma_*\mu_x(F) = \mu_x(\gamma^{-1}(F))$ for any Borel subset F of $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$. Here $\beta_\xi(y,x)$ denotes the Busemann function: $\beta_\xi(x,y) = \lim_{t\to\infty} d(\xi_t, x) - d(\xi_t, y)$ where ξ_t is a geodesic ray tending to ξ as $t \to \infty$.

We denote by $\{\nu_x\}$ the Patterson-Sullivan density, i.e., a Γ-*invariant conformal density* of dimension δ and by $\{m_x : x \in \mathbb{H}^n\}$ a *Lebesgue density*, i.e., a G-invariant conformal density on the boundary $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ of dimension $(n-1)$. Both densities are determined unique up to scalar multiples.

Denote by $\{\mathcal{G}^t : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ the geodesic flow on $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$. For $u \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$, we denote by $u^\pm \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ the forward and the backward endpoints of the geodesic determined by u, i.e., $u^\pm = \lim_{t\to\pm\infty} \mathcal{G}^t(u)$. Fixing $o \in \mathbb{H}^n$, the map

$$u \mapsto (u^+, u^-, s = \beta_{u^-}(o, \pi(u)))$$

is a homeomorphism between $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ with

$$(\partial(\mathbb{H}^n) \times \partial(\mathbb{H}^n) - \{(\xi,\xi) : \xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)\}) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Using this homeomorphism, we define measures $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BMS}}, \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}, \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_*$, $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{Haar}}$ on $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ as follows ([10], [41], [56], [11], [49]):

Definition 2.1. *Set*

(1) $d\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BMS}}(u) = e^{\delta\beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{\delta\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, d\nu_o(u^+) d\nu_o(u^-) ds$;
(2) $d\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(u) = e^{(n-1)\beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{\delta\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, dm_o(u^+) d\nu_o(u^-) ds$;
(3) $d\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_*(u) = e^{\delta\beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{(n-1)\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, d\nu_o(u^+) dm_o(u^-) ds$;
(4) $d\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(u) = e^{(n-1)\beta_{u^+}(o,\pi(u))}\, e^{(n-1)\beta_{u^-}(o,\pi(u))}\, dm_o(u^+) dm_o(u^-) ds.$

The conformal properties of $\{\nu_x\}$ and $\{m_x\}$ imply that these definitions are independent of the choice of $o \in \mathbb{H}^n$. We will extend these measures to G; these extensions depend on the choice of $o \in \mathbb{H}^n$ and $X_0 \in \mathrm{T}^1_o(\mathbb{H}^n)$. Let $K := \mathrm{Stab}_G(o)$ and $M := \mathrm{Stab}_G(X_0)$. Then via the isometric action of G, we have $\mathbb{H}^n \simeq G/K$ and $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) \simeq G/M$. Let $A = \{a_t : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be the one-parameter subgroup of diagonalizable elements in the centralizer of M in G such that $\mathcal{G}^t(X_0) = [M]a_t = [a_t M]$.

Using the identification $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ with G/M, we lift the above measures to G, which will be denoted by the same notation by abuse of notation, so that they are all invariant under M from the right.

These measures are all left Γ-invariant, and hence induce locally finite Borel measures on $\Gamma\backslash G$, which we denote by m^{BMS} (the BMS-measure), m^{BR} (the BR-measure), m_*^{BR} (the BR_* measure), m^{Haar} (the Haar measure) by abuse of notation.

Let N^+ and N^- denote the expanding and the contracting horospherical subgroups, i.e.,

$$N^{\pm} = \{g \in G : a_t g a_{-t} \to e \text{ as } t \to \pm\infty\}.$$

For $g \in G$, define

$$g^{\pm} := (gM)^{\pm} \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^n).$$

We note that m^{BMS}, m^{BR}, and m_*^{BR} are invariant under A, N^+ and N^- respectively and their supports are given respectively by $\{g \in \Gamma\backslash G : g^+, g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$, $\{g \in \Gamma\backslash G : g^- \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$ and $\{g \in \Gamma\backslash G : g^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)\}$. The measure m^{Haar} is invariant under both N^+ and N^-, and hence under G, as N^+ and N^- generate G topologically. That is, m^{Haar} is a Haar measure of G.

We consider the action of G on $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G, m^{\mathrm{Haar}})$ by right translations, which gives rise to the unitary action for the inner product:

$$\langle \Psi_1, \Psi_2 \rangle = \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi_1(g)\overline{\Psi_2(g)} dm^{\mathrm{Haar}}(g).$$

Theorem 2.2. *Let Γ be Zariski dense. For any functions $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in C_c(\Gamma\backslash G)$,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} e^{(n-1-\delta)t} \langle a_t \Psi_1, \Psi_2 \rangle = \frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_1) \cdot m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}.$$

Proof. Roblin [49] proved this for M-invariant functions Ψ_1 and Ψ_2. His proof is based on the mixing of the geodesic flow on $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^n) = \Gamma\backslash G/M$. However the mixing of m^{BMS} was extended to $\Gamma\backslash G$ in [16] for Γ Zariski dense. Based on this, the proof given in [49] can be easily extended to prove the above. □

3. Asymptotic expansion of Matrix coefficients

3.1. **Unitary dual of G.** Let $G = \mathrm{SO}(n,1)^\circ$ for $n \geq 2$ and K a maximal compact subgroup of G. Denoting by $\mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{k}$ the Lie algebras of G and K respectively, let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{p}$ be the corresponding Cartan decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $A = \exp(\mathfrak{a})$ where $\mathfrak{a}$ is a maximal abelian subspace of $\mathfrak{p}$ and let M be the centralizer of A in K.

Define the symmetric bi-linear form $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ by

$$\langle X, Y \rangle := \frac{1}{2(n-1)} B(X, Y) \tag{3.1}$$

where $B(X,Y)=\mathrm{Tr}(\mathrm{ad}X\mathrm{ad}Y)$ denotes the Killing form for $\mathfrak{g}$. The reason for this normalization is so that the Riemannian metric on $G/K \simeq \mathbb{H}^n$ induced by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ has constant curvature -1.

Let $\{X_i\}$ be a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ over $\mathbb{C}$; put $g_{ij}=\langle X_i, X_j\rangle$ and let g^{ij} be the (i,j) entry of the inverse matrix of (g_{ij}). The element

$$\mathcal{C}=\sum g^{ij}X_iX_j$$

is called the Casimir element of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$ (with respect to $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$). It is well-known that this definition is independent of the choice of a basis and that $\mathcal{C}$ lies in the center of the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}})$ of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Denote by $\hat{G}$ the unitary dual, i.e., the set of equivalence classes of irreducible unitary representations of G. A representation $\pi\in\hat{G}$ is said to be *tempered* if for any K-finite vectors v_1, v_2 of π, the matrix coefficient function $g\mapsto\langle\pi(g)v_1, v_2\rangle$ belongs to $L^{2+\epsilon}(G)$ for any $\epsilon>0$. The classification of the unitary dual $\hat{G}$ says that the subset of non-tempered representations in $\hat{G}$ consists of the trivial representation and the complementary series representations $\mathcal{H}_s$ parametrized by $s\in((n-1)/2,(n-1))$ [31]. Our normalization of $\mathcal{C}$ is so that $\mathcal{C}$ acts on $\mathcal{H}_s$ as the scalar $s(s-n+1)$.

3.2. **Standard representations and Complementary series.** Let α denote the simple relative root for $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{a})$. The root subspace $\mathfrak{n}$ of α has dimension $n-1$ and hence ρ, the half-sum of all positive roots of $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{a})$ with multiplicities, is given by $\frac{n-1}{2}\alpha$. Set $N=\exp\mathfrak{n}$. By the Iwasawa decomposition, every element $g\in G$ can be written uniquely as $g=kan$ with $k\in K$, $a\in A$ and $n\in N$. We write $\kappa(g)=k$, $\exp H(g)=a$ and $n(g)=n$.

For any $g\in G$ and $k\in K$, we let $\kappa_g(k)=\kappa(gk)$, and $H_g(k)=H(gk)$ so that

$$gk=\kappa_g(k)\exp(H_g(k))n(gk).$$

Given a complex valued linear function λ on $\mathfrak{a}$, we define a G-representation U^λ on $L^2(K)$ by the prescription: for $\phi\in L^2(K)$ and $g\in G$,

$$U^\lambda(g)\phi=e^{(-(\lambda+2\rho)\circ H_{g^{-1}})}\cdot\phi\circ\kappa_{g^{-1}}. \tag{3.2}$$

This is called a standard representation of G (cf. [58, Sec. 5.5]). Observe that the restriction of U^λ to K coincides with the left regular representation of K on $L^2(K)$: $U^\lambda(k_1)f(k)=f(k_1^{-1}k)$. If R denotes the right regular representation of K on $L^2(K)$, then $R(m)U^\lambda(g)=U^\lambda(g)R(m)$ for all $m\in M$. In particular each M-invariant subspace of $L^2(K)$ for the right translation action is a G-invariant subspace of U^λ.

Let $\tilde{U}^\lambda$ denote the G-representation obtained by restricting each $U^\lambda(g)$ to the subspace

$$L^2(K/M)=\{f\in L^2(K): f(km)=f(k) \text{ for all } m\in M \text{ and } k\in K\}.$$

Then the complementary series representation $\mathcal{H}_s$ is isomorphic to the representation $\tilde{U}^\lambda$ where $\lambda=(s-n+1)\alpha$.

Set $\Omega_K = 1 + \omega_K = 1 - \sum X_i^2$ where $\{X_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. It belongs to the center of the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathbb{C}}$. By Schur's lemma, Ω_K acts on V_σ by a scalar, say, $c(\sigma)$. Since Ω_K acts as a skew-adjoint operator, $c(\sigma)$ is real. Moreover $c(\sigma) \geq 1$, see [58, p. 261], and $\|\Omega_K^\ell v\| = c(\sigma)^\ell \|v\|$ for any smooth vector $v \in V_\sigma$. Furthermore it is shown in [58, Lemma 4.4.2.3] that if ℓ is large enough, then

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \hat{K}} d_\sigma^2 \cdot c(\sigma)^{-\ell} < \infty \tag{3.3}$$

where d_σ is the dimension of σ.

3.3. **Generalized spherical functions and Eisenstein integrals.** Fix a complex valued linear function λ on $\mathfrak{a}$, and the standard representation U^λ. By the Peter-Weyl theorem, we may decompose the left-regular representation $V = L^2(K)$ as $V = \oplus_{\sigma \in \hat{K}} V_\sigma$, where $V_\sigma = L^2(K; \sigma)$ denotes the isotypic K-submodule of type σ, and $V_\sigma \simeq d_\sigma \cdot \sigma$.

For $\sigma \in \hat{K}$, we denote by U_σ^λ the representation of K obtained by restricting $U^\lambda|_K$ to the subspace V_σ. Denote by P_σ the projection operator from V to V_σ and let χ_σ denote the character of σ, that is, the trace operator. It follows from the representation theory of compact Lie groups that P_σ is given by the following:

$$P_\sigma = d_\sigma \int_K \overline{\chi}_\sigma(k) U^\lambda(k) dk.$$

For $\upsilon \in \hat{M}$, we write $\upsilon \subset \sigma$ if υ appears in the decomposition of V_σ as an M-module, and we write $\upsilon \subset \sigma_1 \cap \sigma_2$ if υ appears in the decomposition of both V_{σ_1} and V_{σ_2} as M-modules.

In the rest of this subsection, we fix $\sigma, \tau \in \hat{K}$. Define $T_0 : V_\sigma \to V_\tau$ by

$$T_0(w) = \sum_{\upsilon \subset \sigma \cap \tau} \langle w, \bar{\chi}_\upsilon \rangle \bar{\chi}_\upsilon$$

where χ_υ denotes the character of the representation υ and $\langle w, \bar{\chi}_\upsilon \rangle$ denotes the pairing in V_σ.

Set $E := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(V_\sigma, V_\tau)$. Then E is a (τ, σ)-double representation space, a left τ and right σ-module. We put

$$E_M := \{T \in E : \tau(m)T = T\sigma(m) \text{ for all } m \in M\}.$$

Define $T_\lambda \in E$ by

$$T_\lambda := \int_M U_\tau^\lambda(m) T_0 U_\sigma^\lambda(m^{-1}) dm$$

where dm denotes the probability Haar measure of M. It is easy to check that $T_\lambda \in E_M$.

As integral of the form $\int_K U_\tau^\lambda(\kappa(ak)) T_\lambda U_\sigma^\lambda(k^{-1}) e^{\lambda(H(ak))} dk$ is called an Eisenstein integral.

Clearly, the matrix coefficients of the representation U^λ are understood if we understand $P_\tau U^\lambda(a) P_\sigma$ for all $\tau, \sigma \in \hat{K}$. Via the following theorem whose special case of $\tau = \sigma$ was proved by Harish-Chandra (see [59, Thm. 6.2.2.4]), we will reduce our study of matrix coefficients for U^λ to the investigation of the asymptotics of Eisenstein integrals.

Theorem 3.4. *For any $a \in A$, we have*

$$\mathrm{P}_\tau U^\lambda(a)\mathrm{P}_\sigma = \int_K U^\lambda_\tau(\kappa(ak))T_\lambda U^\lambda_\sigma(k^{-1})e^{\lambda(H(ak))}dk.$$

Proof. For $\bullet \in \hat{K}$ and $\phi \in L^2(K;\bullet)$, we have $U^\lambda_\bullet(k^{-1})\phi = \sum_{\langle \upsilon,\bullet\rangle\neq 0} \phi_{k,\upsilon}$; in particular, $\phi(k) = \sum_{\langle\upsilon,\bullet\rangle\neq 0}\phi_{k,\upsilon}(e)$ and

$$\langle U^\lambda_\bullet(k^{-1})\phi, \bar\chi_\upsilon\rangle = \phi_{k,\upsilon}(e).$$

Let $\varphi \in V_\sigma$ and $\psi \in V_\tau$. For any $g \in G$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U^\lambda_\tau(\kappa(gk))T_0U^\lambda_\sigma(k^{-1})\varphi,\psi\rangle &= \sum_{\langle\upsilon,\tau\rangle\neq 0}\langle U^\lambda_\sigma(k^{-1})\varphi,\bar\chi_\upsilon\rangle\langle U^\lambda_\tau(\kappa(gk))\bar\chi_\upsilon,\psi\rangle \\ &= \sum_{\langle\upsilon,\tau\rangle\neq 0}\varphi_{k,\upsilon}(e)\overline{\psi_{\kappa(gk),\upsilon}(e)}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U^\lambda(a_t)\varphi,\psi\rangle &= \int_K \varphi(\kappa(a_{-t}k)\overline{\psi(k)}e^{-(\lambda+2\rho)H(a_{-t}k)}dk \\ &= \int_K \varphi(k)\overline{\psi(\kappa(a_tk))}e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}dk \\ &= \int_K (\sum_{\langle\upsilon,\sigma\rangle\neq 0}\varphi_{k,\upsilon}(e))\overline{(\sum_{\langle\upsilon,\tau\rangle\neq 0}\psi_{\kappa(a_tk),\upsilon}(e))}e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}dk. \end{aligned}\tag{3.6}$$

We now claim that; if $\upsilon_1 \neq \upsilon_2$, then

$$\int_K \varphi_{k,\upsilon_1}(e)\overline{\psi_{\kappa(a_tk),\upsilon_2}(e)}e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}dk = 0$$

To see this, first note that M and a_t commute, and hence $H(a_tmk) = H(a_tk)$, and $\kappa(a_tmk) = m\kappa(a_tk)$. We also note that

$$\varphi_{k,\upsilon_1} \in \mathrm{P}_{\upsilon_1}(V_\sigma), \text{ and } \varphi_{\kappa(a_tk),\upsilon_2} \in \mathrm{P}_{\upsilon_2}(V_\tau).$$

where $P_\upsilon(V_\bullet)$ denotes the υ-isotypic component of $V_\bullet$. Now if $\upsilon_1 \neq \upsilon_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_K \varphi_{k,\upsilon_1}(e)\overline{\psi_{\kappa(a_tk),\upsilon_2}(e)}e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}dk \\ &= \int_{M\backslash K}(\int_M \varphi_{mk,\upsilon_1}(e)\overline{\psi_{\kappa(a_tmk),\upsilon_2}(e)}e^{\lambda(H(a_tmk))}dm)dk \\ &= \int_{M\backslash K} e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}(\int_M \varphi_{k,\upsilon_1}(m^{-1})\overline{\psi_{\kappa(a_tk),\upsilon_2}(m^{-1})}dm)dk = 0,\end{aligned}$$

implying the claim. This claim in view of our previous calculations (3.5) and (3.6) now implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle U^\lambda(a_t)\varphi,\psi\rangle &= \int_K \langle U^\lambda_\tau(\kappa(a_tk))T_0U^\lambda_\sigma(k^{-1})\varphi,\psi\rangle e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}dk\\ &= \int_K \langle U^\lambda_\tau(\kappa(a_tk))T_\lambda U^\lambda_\sigma(k^{-1})\varphi,\psi\rangle e^{\lambda(H(a_tk))}dk.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\langle P_\tau U^\lambda(a_t)P_\sigma\varphi,\psi\rangle = \langle U^\lambda(a_t)\varphi,\psi\rangle$, this finishes the proof. □

Lemma 3.7. *There exists a constant* $d_0 > 0$ *(independent of* $\sigma,\tau\in\hat{K}$*) such that for any* $\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$*,*

$$\|T_\lambda\| \le d_0\cdot d_\sigma^2\cdot d_\tau^2.$$

Proof. By the Weyl character formula, there exists $d_1>0$ such that $|\chi_\upsilon| \le d_1\cdot d_\upsilon$ for any $\upsilon\in\hat{M}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\|T_0\|^2 &\le \sum_{\upsilon\subset\sigma\cap\tau}\|\chi_\upsilon\|^2 \le d_1^4\sum_{\upsilon\subset\sigma\cap\tau} {d_\upsilon}^4\\ &\le d_1^4(\sum_{\upsilon\subset\sigma} d_\upsilon^2\cdot(\sum_{\upsilon\subset\tau} d_\upsilon^2) \le d_1^4\cdot d_\sigma^2\cdot d_\tau^2.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\|T_\lambda\|\le\|T_0\|\cdot\|\sigma\|\cdot\|\tau\| = \|T_0\|$, the claim follows. □

3.4. **Harish-Chandra's expansion of Eisenstein integrals.**

Fix $\sigma,\tau\in\hat{K}$. Let E and E_M to be as in the previous subsection.

Given $T\in E_M$, $r\in\mathbb{C}$, and $a_t\in A^+$, we investigate an Eisenstein integral:

$$\int_K \tau(\kappa(a_tk))T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\sigma(k^{-1})e^{(ir\alpha-\rho)(H(a_tk))}dk.$$

This is done using a fundamental result of Harish-Chandra which we now recall.

Theorem 3.8. *(Cf.* [59, Theorem 9.1.5.1]*) There exists a subset* $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ *of* $\mathbb{C}$*, whose complement is a locally finite set, such that for any* $r\in\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ *there exist uniquely determined functions* $\mathrm{c}_+(r),\mathrm{c}_-(r)\in\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_M,E_M)$ *such that for all* $T\in E_M$*,*

$$\rho(a_t)\int_K \tau(\kappa(a_tk))T\sigma(k^{-1})e^{(ir\alpha-\rho)H(a_tk)}dk = \Phi(r:a_t)\mathrm{c}_+(r)T + \Phi(-r:a_t)\mathrm{c}_-(r)T$$

where Φ *is a function on* $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}\times A^+$ *taking values in* $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(E_M,E_M)$*, defined as in* (3.12)*.*

Let us note that, fixing T and a_t, the Eisenstein integral on the left hand side of the above is an entire function of r; see [59, Section 9.1.5].

We now discuss the definition and properties of the functions Φ and $\mathrm{c}_\pm$.

3.4.1. *The function* Φ. As in [59, page 287], we will recursively define rational functions $\{\Gamma_\ell : \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ which are holomorphic except at a locally finite subset, say $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,\tau}$. The subset $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ in Theorem 3.8 is indeed $\mathbb{C} - \cup_{r\in\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,\tau}}\{\pm r\}$.

More precisely, let $\mathfrak{l}$ be the Lie algebra of the Cartan subalgebra (=the centralizer of A). Let $H_\alpha \in \mathfrak{l}_\mathbb{C}$ be such that $B(H, H_\alpha) = \alpha(H)$ for all $H \in \mathfrak{l}_\mathbb{C}$.

Let $X_{\pm\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}_\mathbb{C}^{\pm\alpha}$ be chosen so that $[X_\alpha, X_{-\alpha}] = H_\alpha$ and $[H, X_\alpha] = \alpha(H)X_\alpha$. In particular, $B(X_\alpha, X_{-\alpha}) = 1$. Write $X_{\pm\alpha} = Y_{\pm\alpha} + Z_{\pm\alpha}$ where $Y_{\pm\alpha} \in \mathfrak{k}_\mathbb{C}$ and $Z_{\pm\alpha} \in \mathfrak{p}_\mathbb{C}$.

Letting Ω_M denote the Casimir element of M, given $S \in \mathrm{Hom}_\mathbb{C}(E_M, E_M)$, we define $f(S)$ by

$$f(S)T = ST\sigma(\Omega_M), \text{ for all } T \in E_M.$$

Now let $\Gamma_0 = I$ and for any $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $\Gamma_\ell := \Gamma_\ell(ir - \frac{n-1}{2})$'s by the relation:

$$\{\ell(2ir - n + 1) - \ell(\ell - n + 1) - f\}\,\Gamma_\ell = \sum_{j\geq 1}((2ir-n+1)-2(\ell-2j))\Gamma_{\ell-2j}$$
$$+8\sum_{j\geq 1}(2j-1)\tau(Y_\alpha)\sigma(Y_{-\alpha})\Gamma_{\ell-(2j-1)}-8\sum_{j\geq 1} j\,\{\tau(Y_\alpha Y_{-\alpha}) + \sigma(Y_\alpha Y_{-\alpha})\}\,\Gamma_{\ell-2j}.$$

The set $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ consists of r's such that $\{\ell(2ir - n + 1) - \ell(\ell - n + 1) - f\}$ is invertible so that the recursive definition of the Γ_ℓ's is meaningful.

Lemma 3.9. *Fix any $t_0 > 0$ and a compact subset $\omega \subset \mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$. There exist b_ω (depending only on t_0 and ω) and $N_0 > 1$ (independent of $\sigma, \tau \in \hat{K}$) such that for any $r \in \omega$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|\Gamma_\ell(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| \leq b_\omega d_\sigma^{N_0} d_\tau^{N_0} e^{\ell t_0}.$$

Proof. Our proof uses an idea of the proof of [59, Lemmas 9.1.4.3-4]. For $s = ir - \frac{n-1}{2}$, and $T \in \mathrm{Hom}_\mathbb{C}(E_M, E_M)$, define

$$\Lambda_\ell(T) := \left(-\ell^2 + \ell(2s - n + 1) - f\right)T.$$

For q_σ and q_τ which are respectively the highest weights for σ and τ,

$$\max\{\|\tau(Y_\alpha)\sigma(Y_{-\alpha})\|, \|\tau(Y_\alpha Y_{-\alpha})\|, \sigma(Y_\alpha Y_{-\alpha})\|\}$$
$$\leq c_0 \cdot (q_\sigma q_\tau + q_\sigma^2 + q_\sigma^2) d_\sigma d_\tau \leq c_0' d_\sigma^3 d_\tau^3$$

for some $c_0, c_0' > 0$ independent of σ and τ. Hence for some $c_1 = c_1(\omega)$, for all $r \in \omega$,

$$\|\Gamma_\ell(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| \leq \ell \cdot \|\Lambda_\ell^{-1}\| \cdot c_1 d_\sigma^3 d_\tau^3 \sum_{j<\ell} \|\Gamma_{\ell-j}\|. \tag{3.10}$$

Let N_1 be an integer such that $\ell^2 \cdot \|\Lambda_\ell^{-1}\| \cdot (1 - e^{-t_0})^{-1} c_1 d_\sigma^3 d_\tau^3 \leq N_1$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. Since $\|\Lambda_\ell^{-1}\| \ll \ell^{-2}$ as $\ell \to \infty$ and the coefficients of f depend only on the eigenvalues of Ω_M for those $\upsilon \in \hat{M}$ contained in σ, we can take $N_1 = N_1(\omega)$ so that $N_1 \leq c_2 d_\sigma^{N_2} d_\tau^{N_2}$ for some $N_2 \geq 1$ and $c_2 = c_2(\omega) > 1$ (independent of σ and τ).

Set

$$M(t_0,\omega) := \max_{\ell\le N_1, r\in\omega} \|\Gamma_\ell(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| e^{-\ell t_0}.$$

By (3.10) together with the observation that both $N_1 = N_1(\omega)$ and $\max_{\ell\le N_1} \|\Lambda_\ell^{-1}\|$ are bounded by a polynomial in d_σ and d_τ, we have $M(t_0,\omega) \le b_\omega d_\sigma^{N_0} d_\tau^{N_0}$ for some $N_0 \ge 1$ and $b_\omega > 0$.

We shall now show by induction that for all $r\in\omega$ and for all $\ell\ge 1$,

$$\|\Gamma_\ell(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| \le M(t_0,\omega) e^{\ell t_0}. \tag{3.11}$$

First note that (3.11) holds for all $\ell \le N_1$ by the definition of $M(t_0,\omega)$. Now for any $N_1 > N$, suppose (3.11) holds for each $\ell < N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\|\Gamma_N(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| &\le N^{-1}(N^2\|\Lambda_N^{-1}\| c_1 d_\sigma^3 d_\tau^3) \sum_{j<N} \|\Gamma_{N-j}(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| \\ &\le N^{-1} N_1 (1-e^{-t_0}) M(t_0,\omega) \sum_{j<N} e^{(N-j)t_0} \\ &\le M(t_0,\omega) e^{N t_0},\end{aligned}$$

finishing the proof. □

Following Warner, (Cf. [59, Theorem 9.1.4.1]), we define

$$\Phi(r : a_t) = e^{irt} \sum_{\ell\ge 0} \Gamma_\ell(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2}) e^{-\ell t} \tag{3.12}$$

which converges for all large enough t by Lemma 3.9.

3.4.2. *The function* $\mathrm{c}_\pm$. Let $N^- = \exp(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ be the root subspace corresponding to $-\alpha$, and d_{N^-} denote a Haar measure on N^- normalized so that $\int_{N^-} e^{-2\rho(H(n))} d_{N^-}(n) = 1$.

The following is due to Harish-Chandra; see [59, Thm. 9.1.6.1].

Theorem 3.13. *For* $r \in \mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ *with* $\Im(r) < 0$*,* $\mathrm{c}_+(r)$ *is holomorphic and given by*

$$\mathrm{c}_+(r)T = \int_{N^-} T\sigma(\kappa(n)^{-1}) e^{-(ir\alpha+\rho)(H(n))} d_{N^-}(n).$$

Corollary 3.14. *There exists* $d_1 > 0$ *(independent of* $\sigma,\tau \in \hat{K}$*) such that for any* $r \in \mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ *with* $\Im(r) < 0$*, we have*

$$\|\mathrm{c}_+(r)\| \le d_1 \cdot d_\sigma^2 \cdot \int_{N^-} e^{-(\Re(ir)\alpha+\rho)H(n)} d_{N^-}(n).$$

Proof. There exists $d_1 > 0$ such that the highest weight of σ is bounded by $d_1 \cdot d_\sigma$ for all $\sigma \in \hat{K}$. Hence, for any $k \in K$,

$$\|\sigma(k)\| \le d_\sigma \cdot \text{the highest weight of } \sigma \le d_1 \cdot d_\sigma^2.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 3.13, for $r \in \mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$, and $T \in E_M$,

$$\|\mathrm{c}_+(r)T\| \le \|T\| \cdot d_1 \cdot d_\sigma^2 \cdot \int_{N^-} e^{-(\Re(ir)\alpha+\rho)H(n)} d_{N^-}(n). \tag{3.15}$$

$\square$

Proposition 3.16. *Fix a compact subset* ω *contained in* $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}\cap\{\Im(r)<0\}$. *There exist* $d_1=d_1(\omega)$ *and* $N_2>1$ *such that for any* $r\in\omega$, *we have*

$$\|\mathrm{c}_{\pm}(r)T_{\pm ir\alpha-\rho}\|\leq d_1\cdot d_\tau^{N_2}d_\sigma^{N_2}.$$

Proof. By the assumption on ω, the integral $\int_{N^-}e^{-(\Re(ir)\alpha+\rho)H(n)}d_{N^-}(n)$ converges uniformly for all $r\in\omega$. Hence the bound for $\mathrm{c}_+(r)T_{ir\alpha-\rho}$ follows from Corollary 3.14 together with Lemma 3.7. To get a bound for $\mathrm{c}_-(r)T_{-ir\alpha-\rho}$, we recall that

$$\begin{aligned}&e^{(-ir+\frac{n-1}{2})t}\int_K\tau(\kappa(a_tk))T\sigma(k^{-1})e^{(ir\alpha-\rho)(H(a_tk))}dk\\&\qquad\qquad=e^{-irt}\Phi(r:a_t)\mathrm{c}_+(r)T+e^{-irt}\Phi(-r:a_t)\mathrm{c}_-(r)T.\end{aligned}$$

Then $e^{-irt}\Phi(-r:a_t)=I+\sum_{\ell\geq1}\Gamma_\ell(-ir-\frac{n-1}{2})e^{-\ell t}$, and applying Lemma 3.9 with $t_0=1$, we get

$$\sum_{\ell\geq1}\|\Gamma_\ell(-ir-\tfrac{n-1}{2})e^{-\ell t}\|\leq b_\omega d_\sigma^{N_0}d_\tau^{N_0}\sum_{\ell\geq1}e^{\ell(1-t)}.$$

Fix $t_0>0$ so that $b_\omega d_\sigma^{N_0}d_\tau^{N_0}\sum_{\ell\geq1}e^{\ell(1-t_0)}<1/2$; then $t_0\gg\log(d_\sigma d_\tau)$. Now $A_r:=e^{-irt_0}\Phi(-r:a_{t_0})$ is invertible and for some N_1 and b'_ω,

$$\|A_r^{-1}\|\leq b'_\omega d_\sigma^{N_1}d_\tau^{N_1}. \tag{3.17}$$

Since the map $k\mapsto H(a_{t_0}k)$ is continuous, we have $\int_K|e^{(ir\alpha-\rho)(H(a_{t_0}k))}|dk<d_\omega$ for all $r\in\omega$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathrm{c}_-(r)T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\|\\&\leq\|A_r^{-1}\|\cdot|e^{(-ir+\frac{n-1}{2})t_0}\int_K\tau(\kappa(a_{t_0}k))T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\sigma(k^{-1})e^{(ir\alpha-\rho)(H(a_{t_0}k))}dk|\\&+\|A_r^{-1}\|\cdot\|e^{-irt_0}\Phi(r:a_{t_0})\mathrm{c}_+(r)T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\|\\&\leq\|A_r^{-1}\|\cdot d_\omega\left(\max_{k\in K}\|\tau(\kappa(a_{t_0}k))T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\sigma(k^{-1})\|+\|\mathrm{c}_+(r)T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\|\right).\end{aligned}$$

Hence the claim on $\|\mathrm{c}_-(r)T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\|$ now follows from (3.17), Lemma 3.7 and the bound for $\|\mathrm{c}_+(r)T_{ir\alpha-\rho}\|$. $\square$

3.5. Asymptotic expansion of the matrix coefficients of the complementary series.

Fix a parameter $(n-1)/2<s_0<(n-1)$ for the complementary series, and recall that $2\rho=(n-1)\alpha$. We apply the result of the previous subsection to the representation $U^{s_0-n+1}=U^{s_0-2\rho}$.

The following theorem is a key ingredient of the proof of Theorem 3.28.

Theorem 3.18. *There exist* $\eta_0>0$ *and* $N>1$ *such that for any* $\sigma,\tau\in\hat{K}$, *for all* $t>2$, *we have*

$$P_\tau U^{(s_0-n+1)\alpha}(a_t)P_\sigma=e^{(s_0-n+1)t}\mathrm{c}_+(r_{s_0})T_{(s_0-n+1)\alpha}+O(d_\sigma^N\cdot d_\tau^N e^{(s_0-n+1-\eta_0)t}),$$

with the implied constant independent of σ,τ.

Proof. Set $r_s := -i(s-\rho) \in \mathbb{C}$, for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$. In particular, $\Im(r_s) < 0$ for $(n-1)/2 < s < (n-1)$.

Fix $t > 0$, and define $F_t : \mathbb{C} \to E_M$ by

$$F_t(s) := P_\tau U^{s\alpha - 2\rho}(a_t) P_\sigma.$$

As was remarked following Theorem 3.8, for each fixed $t > 0$, the function $F_t(s)$ is analytic on $\mathbb{C}$. Thus in view of Theorem 3.13, we have, whenever $r_s \in \mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$ and $\Im(r_s) < 0$,

$$F_t(s) - e^{(s-n+1)t} \mathrm{c}_+(r_s) T_{s\alpha-2\rho} \text{ is analytic.} \tag{3.19}$$

Recall the notation $\mathcal{S}_{\sigma,\tau}$, that is, $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau} = \mathbb{C} - \cup_{r \in \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,\tau}} \{\pm r\}$, and set $\mathcal{S}'_{\sigma,\tau} = \{s : r_s \in \mathcal{S}_{\sigma,\tau}\}$. Define

$$G_t(s) = F_t(s) - e^{(s-n+1)t} \mathrm{c}_+(r_s) T_{s\alpha-2\rho}.$$

Indeed the map $s \mapsto G_t(s)$ is analytic on $\{s : \Im(r_s) < 0\} - \mathcal{S}'_{\sigma,\tau}$. Choose a small circle ω' of radius at most $1/2$ centered at s_0 such that $\{r_s : s \in \omega'\} \cap \left(\cup_{\sigma',\tau' \in \hat{K}} \pm \mathcal{S}_{\sigma',\tau'}\right) = \emptyset$, since $\cup_{\sigma',\tau' \in \hat{K}} \pm \mathcal{S}'_{\sigma',\tau'}$ is countable, such ω' exists, and the intersection of ω' and the real axis is contained in the interval $((n-1)/2, n-1)$. Note that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for all $s \in \omega'$,

$$(n-1) - s_0 + \eta < \Re(s) < s_0 + 1 - \eta. \tag{3.20}$$

Then $G_t(s)$ is analytic on the disc bounded by ω'. Hence by the maximum principle, we get

$$\|G_t(s_0)\| \le \max_{s \in \omega'} \|G_t(s)\|. \tag{3.21}$$

Since $\omega := \{r_s : s \in \omega'\} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\sigma,\tau}$, Theorems 3.4 and 3.8 imply that for all $s \in \omega'$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_t(s) = e^{(s-n+1)t} (&\sum_{\ell \ge 1} e^{-\ell t} \Gamma_\ell(ir_s - \tfrac{n-1}{2}) \mathrm{c}_+(r_s) T_{s\alpha-2\rho}) \\ &+ e^{-st} (\sum_{\ell \ge 0} e^{-\ell t} \Gamma_\ell(-ir_s - \tfrac{n-1}{2}) \mathrm{c}_-(r_s) T_{s\alpha-2\rho}). \end{aligned}$$

Fixing any $t_0 > 0$, by Lemma 3.9, there exists $b_0 = b_0(t_0, \omega) > 0$ such that for all $r \in \omega$,

$$\|\Gamma_\ell(ir - \tfrac{n-1}{2})\| \le b_0 \cdot d_\sigma^{N_0} \cdot d_\tau^{N_0} \cdot e^{\ell t_0}. \tag{3.22}$$

Also by (3.15), there exists $B_\omega > 0$ (independent of $\sigma, \tau \in \hat{K}$) such that for all $r \in \omega$,

$$\|\mathrm{c}_\pm(r) T_{\pm ir\alpha - \rho}\| \le d_1 \cdot B_\omega \cdot d_\sigma^{N_2} \cdot d_\tau^{N_2}.$$

Let $t > t_0 + 1$ so that $\sum_{\ell \ge 0} e^{-\ell(t-t_0)} \le 2$. Then we have for any $t > 0$ and $s \in \omega'$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\sum_{\ell \ge 1} e^{-\ell t} \Gamma_\ell(ir_s - \tfrac{n-1}{2}) \mathrm{c}_+(r_s) T_{s\alpha - 2\rho}\| \\
&\le B_\omega \cdot d_\sigma^{N_0+N_2} d_\tau^{N_0+N_2} \cdot b_{\sigma,\tau} \cdot e^{-t} e^{t_0} \sum_{\ell \ge 0} e^{-\ell(t-t_0)} \\
&\le \left(2e^{t_0} B_\omega \cdot b_0 \cdot d_\sigma^{N_0+N_2} \cdot d_\tau^{N_0+N_2}\right) e^{-t}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\sum_{\ell \ge 0} e^{-\ell t} \Gamma_\ell(-ir_s - \tfrac{n-1}{2}) \mathrm{c}_-(r_s) T_{s\alpha - 2\rho}\| \le 2B_\omega b_0 \cdot d_\sigma^{N_0+N_2} \cdot d_\tau^{N_0+N_2}. \tag{3.23}$$

We now combine these and the expression for $G_t(s)$, for $s \in \omega'$ and get for all $t > t_0 + 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|G_t(s_0)\| \\
&\le 2B_\omega b_0 (e^{t_0} + 1) d_\sigma^{N_0+N_2} \cdot d_\tau^{N_0+N_2} \cdot \max_{s \in \omega'} (e^{(\Re(s) - n)t} + e^{-\Re(s)t}) \\
&\le b' \cdot d_\sigma^{N_0+N_2} \cdot d_\tau^{N_0+N_2} e^{(s_0 - (n-1) - \eta)t}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\eta > 0$ is as in (3.20) and $b' > 0$ is a constant independent of $\sigma, \tau \in \hat{K}$.

Since $P_\tau U^{(s_0-n+1)\alpha}(a_t) P_\sigma = e^{(s_0-n+1)t} \mathrm{c}_+(r_{s_0}) T_{(s_0-n+1)\alpha} + G_t(s_0)$, this finishes the proof. □

By Theorem 3.4, Theorem 3.18 implies:

Theorem 3.24. *Let $(n-1)/2 < s_0 < (n-1)$. There exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and $N > 1$ such that for all $t \ge 2$ and for any unit vectors $v_\sigma \in V_\sigma$ and $v_\tau \in V_\tau$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle U^{(s_0-n+1)\alpha}(a_t)(v_\sigma), v_\tau)\rangle \\
&\qquad = e^{(s_0-n+1)t} \langle \mathrm{c}_+(r_{s_0}) T_{(s_0-n+1)\alpha}(v_\sigma), v_\tau\rangle + O(d_\sigma^N d_\tau^N e^{(s_0-n+1-\eta_0)t}),
\end{aligned}$$

with the implied constant independent of $\sigma, \tau, v_\sigma, v_\tau$.

3.6. **Decay of matrix coefficients for $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$.** Let $\Gamma < G$ be a torsion-free geometrically finite group with $\delta > (n-1)/2$.

By the classification of $\hat{G}$, the non-spherical part of $\hat{G}$ lies in the tempered spectrum. Hence every $\rho \in \hat{G}$ appearing in the non-tempered spectrum of $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)$ also appears in $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G)^K = L^2(\Gamma\backslash \mathbb{H}^n)$. Therefore the following follows from Lax-Phillips [36] and Sullivan [55] :

Theorem 3.25. *There exist $(n-1)/2 < s_k \le s_{k-1} \le s_1 < s_0 \le (n-1)$ such that*

$$L^2(\Gamma\backslash G) = \mathcal{H}_{s_0} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{H}_{s_k} \oplus \mathcal{W}$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ consists of tempered representations. Moreover $\delta = s_0$.

For $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \le p \le \infty$, we consider the following Sobolev norm:

$$\mathcal{S}_{p,\ell}(\Psi) = \sum \|X(\Psi)\|_p \tag{3.26}$$

where the sum is taken over all monomials X in a fixed basis $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ of order at most ℓ and $\|X(\Psi)\|_p$ denotes the $L^p(\Gamma\backslash G)$-norm of $X(\Psi)$. Since we will be using $\mathcal{S}_{2,\ell}$ most often, we will set $\mathcal{S}_\ell = \mathcal{S}_{2,\ell}$.

For a unitary G-representation space W and a smooth vector $w \in W$, $\mathcal{S}_\ell(w)$ is defined similarly: $\mathcal{S}_\ell(w) = \sum \|X.w\|_2$ where the sum is taken over all monomials X in $\mathcal{B}$ of order at most ℓ.

Proposition 3.27. *Fix $(n-1)/2 < s_1 < (n-1)$. Let W be a unitary representation of G which does not weakly contain any complementary series representation $\mathcal{H}_s$ with parameter $s > s_1$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $c_\epsilon > 0$ such that for any smooth vectors $w_1, w_2 \in W$ and for any $t > 0$, we have*

$$|\langle a_t w_1, w_2\rangle| \le c_\epsilon \cdot \mathcal{S}_{\ell_0}(w_1) \cdot \mathcal{S}_{\ell_0}(w_2) \cdot e^{(s_1-n+1+\epsilon)t}$$

where $\ell_0 \ge 1$ depends only on G and K.

Proof. This proposition is proved in [30, Proof of Prop. 5.3] for $n = 3$ (based on an earlier idea of [53]), and its proof easily extends to a general $n \ge 2$. □

Theorem 3.28. *There exist $\eta > 0$ (depending only on the spectral gap for Γ), and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ (independent of Γ) such that for any real-valued functions $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)$ as $t \to +\infty$,*

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\langle a_t\Psi_1, \Psi_2\rangle = \frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_1)\cdot m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} + O(e^{-\eta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_2)).$$

Proof. Let $V = \mathcal{H}_\delta$ so that $L^2(\Gamma\backslash G) = V \oplus V^\perp$. Given $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)$, we write $\Psi_i = \Psi_i' + \Psi_i^\perp$, where Ψ_i' and $\Psi_i^\perp$ are the projections of Ψ_i to V and $V^\perp$ respectively. Then by Proposition 3.27, there exist $\ell_0 \ge 1$ such that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\langle a_t\Psi_1^\perp, \Psi_2^\perp\rangle = O(\mathcal{S}_{\ell_0}(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_{\ell_0}(\Psi_2)e^{(s_1-n+1+\epsilon)t}). \tag{3.29}$$

If $\delta = n-1$ and hence if $V = \mathbb{C}$, it is easy to see that (3.29) finishes the proof. Now suppose $\delta < n-1$, so that $V = \mathcal{H}_\delta$ is a complementary series representation.

Writing $V = \oplus_{\sigma\in\hat{K}} V_\sigma$, let Θ_σ be an orthonormal basis of V_σ. By Theorem 3.24 and our discussion in section 3.2, there exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $t \gg 1$,

$$\langle a_t v_\sigma, v_\tau\rangle := c(v_\sigma, v_\tau)e^{(\delta-n+1)t} + O(d_\sigma^N d_\tau^N e^{(\delta-n+1-\eta_0)t}) \tag{3.30}$$

where $c(v_\sigma, v_\tau) = \langle \mathrm{c}_+(r_\delta)T_{(\delta-n+1)\alpha}v_\sigma, v_\tau\rangle$.

As $\Psi_i' = \sum_{\sigma\in\hat{K}}\sum_{v_\sigma\in\Theta_\sigma}\langle\Psi_i, v_\sigma\rangle v_\sigma$, we have for each $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle a_t\Psi_1', \Psi_2'\rangle = \sum_{\sigma,\tau\in\hat{K}}\ \sum_{v_\sigma\in\Theta_\sigma, v_\tau\in\Theta_\tau}\langle\Psi_1, v_\sigma\rangle\cdot\overline{\langle\Psi_2, v_\tau\rangle}\cdot\langle a_t v_\sigma, v_\tau\rangle$$

where the convergence follows from the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality.

Therefore, by (3.30),

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle a_t\Psi_1',\Psi_2'\rangle\\ &=\left(\sum_{\sigma,\tau\in\hat K}\sum_{v_\sigma\in\Theta_\sigma,v_\tau\in\Theta_\tau}\langle\Psi_1,v_\sigma\rangle\overline{\langle\Psi_2,v_\tau\rangle}c(v_\sigma,v_\tau)\right)e^{(\delta-n+1)t}\\ &+\sum_{\sigma,\tau\in\hat K}\sum_{v_\sigma\in\Theta_\sigma,v_\tau\in\Theta_\tau}d_\sigma^N d_\tau^N\langle\Psi_1,v_\sigma\rangle\overline{\langle\Psi_2,v_\tau\rangle}O(e^{(\delta-n+1-\eta_0)t})).\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$\mathcal{E}(\Psi_1,\Psi_2):=\left(\sum_{\sigma,\tau\in\hat K}\sum_{v_\sigma\in\Theta_\sigma,v_\tau\in\Theta_\tau}\langle\Psi_1,v_\sigma\rangle\overline{\langle\Psi_2,v_\tau\rangle}c(v_\sigma,v_\tau)\right).$$

By (3.3), there exists $\ell\ge\ell_0$ such that

$$\sum_{\sigma,\tau\in\hat K}d_\sigma^{N+1}d_\tau^{N+1}c(\sigma)^{-\ell}c(\tau)^{-\ell}<\infty \tag{3.31}$$

where $c(\sigma)$ is as in (3.3). Since for any unit vector $v\in V_\sigma$ and any $m\gg1$,

$$|\langle\Psi,v\rangle|\ll c(\sigma)^{-m}\mathcal{S}_m(\Psi),$$

we now deduce that

$$\langle a_t\Psi_1',\Psi_2'\rangle=\mathcal{E}(\Psi_1,\Psi_2)e^{(\delta-n+1)t}+O(e^{(\delta-n+1-\eta_0)t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_2)).$$

Hence, together with (3.29), it implies that there exists $\eta>0$ such that

$$\langle a_t\Psi_1,\Psi_2\rangle=\mathcal{E}(\Psi_1,\Psi_2)e^{(\delta-n+1)t}+O(e^{(\delta-n+1-\eta)t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_2)).$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 2.2,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\langle a_t\Psi_1,\Psi_2\rangle=\frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_1)\cdot m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}.$$

It follows that the infinite sum $\mathcal{E}(\Psi_1,\Psi_2)$ converges and

$$\mathcal{E}(\Psi_1,\Psi_2)=\frac{m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_1)\cdot m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}.$$

This finishes the proof. □

As $\langle a_{-t}\Psi_1,\Psi_2\rangle=\langle a_t\Psi_2,\Psi_1\rangle$ for Ψ_i's real-valued, we deduce the following from Theorem 3.28:

Corollary 3.32. *There exist $\eta>0$ and $\ell\in\mathbb{N}$ such that, as $t\to+\infty$,*

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\langle a_{-t}\Psi_1,\Psi_2\rangle=\frac{m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_1)\cdot m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_2)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}+O(e^{-\eta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_2)).$$

4. NON-WANDERING COMPONENT OF $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H a_t$ AS $t \to \infty$

4.1. **Basic setup.** Let H be either a symmetric subgroup or a horospherical subgroup of G. We will set $K, M, A = \{a_t\}$ in each case as follows to be used in the rest of the paper.

If H is symmetric, that is, H is equal to the group of σ-fixed points for some involution σ of G, up to conjugation and commensurability, H is $\mathrm{SO}(k,1)\times\mathrm{SO}(n-k)$ for some $1 \le k \le n-1$. Let θ be a Cartan involution of G which commutes with σ and set K to be the maximal compact subgroup fixed by θ. Let $G = K\exp\mathfrak{p}$ be the Cartan decomposition and write $\mathfrak{g}$ as a direct sum of $d\sigma$ eigenspaces: $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h}\oplus\mathfrak{q}$ where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the Lie algebra of H and $\mathfrak{q}$ is the -1 eigenspace for $d\sigma$. Let $\mathfrak{a}\subset\mathfrak{p}\cap\mathfrak{q}$ be an abelian subspace and set $A = \exp\mathfrak{a} = \{a_t := \exp(tY_0) : t\in\mathbb{R}\}$ where Y_0 is a norm one element in $\mathfrak{a}$ with respect to the Riemannian metric induced by $\langle,\rangle$ defined in (3.1). Let M be the centralizer of A in K.

If H is a horospherical subgroup of G, we let $A = \{a_t\}$ be a one-parameter subgroup of diagonalizable elements so that H is the expanding horospherical subgroup for a_t. Letting M the maximal compact subgroup in the centralizer of A, we may assume that the right translation action of a_t corresponds to the geodesic flow on $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) = G/M$, by changing the parametrization if necessary. Let K be the stabilizer of the base point of the vector in $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ corresponding to M.

In both cases, let $o\in\mathbb{H}^n$ and $X_0\in\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ be points stabilized by K and M respectively. Let N^+ and N^- be the expanding and contracting horospherical subgroups of G with respect to a_t, respectively.

4.2. The goal of the rest of this section is to describe the set $\{h\in\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H : ha_t\in\Omega \text{ for some } t>0\}$ for any given compact subset Ω of $\Gamma\backslash G$. Let Γ be a torsion-free geometrically finite subgroup of G. Let $\Lambda_p(\Gamma)\subset\Lambda(\Gamma)$ denote the set of all parabolic fixed points of Γ. As is well known in the case of geometrically finite groups, each parabolic fixed point ξ is a bounded parabolic fixed point, i.e., $\mathrm{Stab}_\Gamma(\xi)$ acts co-compactly on $\Lambda(\Gamma)-\{\xi\}$. Recall the notation $g^+ = g(X_0)^+$ and $g^- = g(X_0)^-$.

Consider the upper half space model for $\mathbb{H}^n = \{(x,y) : x\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}, y\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$. We set $\mathbb{R}^n_+ := \{(x,y) : x\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}, y\in\mathbb{R}_{>0}\}$, so that $\partial(\mathbb{R}^n_+) = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}\times\{0\}$. Suppose that ∞ is a parabolic fixed point for Γ. Set $\Gamma_\infty := \mathrm{Stab}_\Gamma(\infty)$ and let Γ' be a normal abelian subgroup Γ' of Γ_∞ which is of finite index; this exists by a theorem of Biberbach. Let L be a minimal Γ_∞-invariant subspace in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. By Prop. 2.2.6 in [9], Γ' acts as translations and cocompactly on L. We note that L may not be unique, but any two such are Euclidean-parallel.

The notation d_{Euc} denotes the Euclidean distance in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Following Bowditch [9], we write for each $r>0$:

$$C(L,r) := \{x\in\mathbb{R}^n_+\cup\partial(\mathbb{R}^n_+) : d_{\mathrm{Euc}}(x,L)\ge r\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Each $C(L,r)$ is Γ_∞-invariant and called a standard parabolic region (or extended horoball) associated to $\xi=\infty$.

Theorem 4.2. [9, Prop. 4.4] *For any* $\epsilon_0 > 0$*, there exists* $r_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $r \geq r_0$*,*

(1) $\gamma C(L,r) = C(L,r)$ *if* $\gamma \in \Gamma_\infty$
(2) *if* $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Gamma_\infty$*,* $d(C(L,r), \gamma C(L,r)) > \epsilon_0$*.*

Corollary 4.3. *Suppose that* ∞ *is a bounded parabolic fixed point for* Γ*. Then for any sufficiently large* r*, the natural projection map*

$$\Gamma_\infty \backslash (C(L,r) \cap \mathbb{H}^n) \to \Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^n$$

is injective and proper.

Proof. We fix $\epsilon_0 > 0$, and let $r_0 > 0$ be as in the above theorem 4.2. Let $r > r_0$, and set $C_\infty = C(L,r) \cap \mathbb{H}^n$ for simplicity. The injectivity is immediate from Theorem 4.2(2). Since C_∞ is closed in $\mathbb{H}^n$, we have that γC_∞ is closed for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Hence to prove the properness of the map, it is sufficient to show that if F is a compact subset of $\mathbb{H}^n$, then F intersects at most finitely many distinct γC_∞'s. Now suppose there exists an infinite sequence $\{\gamma_i \in \Gamma - \Gamma_\infty\}$ with $F \cap \gamma_i C_\infty \neq \emptyset$. Choosing $y_i \in F \cap \gamma_i C_\infty$, by Theorem 4.2(2), we have $d(y_i, y_j) \geq \epsilon_0$ for all $i \neq j$, which contradicts the assumption that F is compact. ☐

4.3. H horospherical.

Theorem 4.4. *Let* $H = N$ *be a horospherical subgroup. Suppose that* $\Gamma \backslash \Gamma NM$ *is closed in* $\Gamma \backslash G$*. For any compact subset* Ω *of* $\Gamma \backslash G$*, the set* $\Gamma \backslash \Gamma NM \cap \Omega A$ *is relatively compact.*

Proof. We may assume without loss of generality that the horosphere NK/K in $G/K \simeq \mathbb{H}^n$ is based at ∞. Note that $\Gamma_\infty \subset NM$ and that the closeness of $\Gamma \backslash \Gamma NM$ implies that $\Gamma_\infty \backslash NM \to \Gamma \backslash G$ is a proper map.

Therefore, if the claim does not hold, there exists a sequence $n_i \in NM$ which is unbounded modulo Γ_∞ such that $\gamma_i n_i a_{t_i} \to x$ for some $t_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$ and $x \in G$.

It follows that $n_i a_{t_i}(o) \to \infty$ and $d(n_i a_{t_i}, \gamma_i^{-1} x) \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Therefore $\gamma_i^{-1} x(o) \to \infty$ and hence $\infty \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$.

Since the image of the horosphere $N(o)$ in $\Gamma \backslash \mathbb{H}^n = \Gamma \backslash G/K$ is closed, it follows that ∞ is a bounded parabolic fixed point for Γ by [12]. Therefore Γ_∞ acts co-compactly on an r neighborhood of L in $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n) - \{\infty\} = \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ for some $r > 0$. Write $n_i a_{t_i}(o) = (x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Since $\{n_i\}$ is unbounded modulo Γ_∞, after passing to a subsequence if necessary, we have $d_{\mathrm{Euc}}(x_i, L) \to \infty$. It follows that for any r, $(x_i, y_i) \in C(L,r)$ for all large i. Since n_i is unbounded modulo Γ_∞, we get $n_i a_{t_i} = (x_i, y_i)$ is unbounded in $\Gamma_\infty \backslash C(L,r)$. Thus by Corollary 4.3, $n_i a_{t_i}$ must be unbounded modulo Γ, which is a contradiction. ☐

We remark that Corollary 4.3 and Theorem 4.4 appeared in an earlier arXiv version of [46].

4.4. H **symmetric.** We now consider the case when H is symmetric. Then $H(o) = H/H \cap K$ is a totally geodesic submanifold in $G(o) = G/K = \mathbb{H}^n$. We denote by π the canonical projection from G to $G/K = \mathbb{H}^n$. We set $\tilde{S} = H(o)$. By $\partial(H)$, we mean the boundary of $\tilde{S}$.

Fixing a compact subset Ω of $\Gamma\backslash G$, define

$$H_\Omega := \{h \in H : \Gamma\backslash\Gamma h a_t \in \Omega \text{ for some } t > 0\}$$

and set $\tilde{S}_\Omega = H_\Omega(o)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\xi \in \partial(\tilde{S})$. If $\xi \notin \Lambda(\Gamma)$, then there exists a neighborhood U of ξ in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^n}$ such that $U \cap \tilde{S}_\Omega = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose not, then there exist $h_n \in H$, $\gamma_n \in \Gamma$ and $t_n > 0$ such that $\gamma_n h_n a_{t_n} \in \Omega_0$ and $h_n(o) \to \xi$. Note that $\{h_n a_t(o) : t > 0\}$ denotes the (half) geodesic emanating from $\pi(h_n)$ and orthogonal to $\tilde{S}$. Recall that $h_n(o)$ converges to $\xi \in \partial\mathbb{H}^n$. There are two possibilities: either $\xi = \infty$ which implies the (euclidean) radius of the corresponding semicircle defined by this geodesic tends to infinity or $\xi \neq \infty$ which implies the (euclidean) radius of the corresponding semicircle defined by this geodesic tends to zero. In either case we have $h_n a_{t_n}(o) \to \xi$.

Now since Ω is compact, by passing to a subsequence in necessary, we may assume $\gamma_n h_n a_{t_n} \to x$. As G acts by isometries on $\mathbb{H}^n$, we get $\gamma_n^{-1}(x(o)) \to \xi$. This implies $\xi \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ which is a contradiction. □

Fix a Dirichlet domain $\mathcal{D}$ for $H \cap \Gamma$ in $\tilde{S}$ and set

$$\mathcal{D}_\Omega = \mathcal{D} \cap \tilde{S}_\Omega. \tag{4.6}$$

Corollary 4.7. *Assume that the orbit $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ is closed in $\Gamma\backslash G$. There exist a compact subset Y_0 of $\mathcal{D}$ and a finite subset $\{\xi_1, \dots \xi_m\} \subset \Lambda_p(\Gamma) \cap \partial(\tilde{S})$ such that*

$$\mathcal{D}_\Omega \subset Y_0 \cup (\cup_{i=1}^m U(\xi_i))$$

where $U(\xi_i)$ is a neighborhood of ξ_i in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^n}$.

Proof. For each $\xi \in \partial(\tilde{S}) \cap \partial(\mathcal{D})$, let $U(\xi)$ be a neighborhood of ξ in $\overline{\mathbb{H}^n}$. When $\xi \notin \Lambda(\Gamma)$, we may assume by Lemma 4.5 that $U(\xi) \cap \tilde{S}_\Omega = \emptyset$. By the compactness of $\partial(\tilde{S}) \cap \partial(\mathcal{D})$, there exists a finite covering $\cup_{i\in I} U(\xi_i)$ for some finite set ξ_i's in $\partial(\mathcal{D})$. Set $Y_0 := \mathcal{D} - \cup_{i\in I} U(\xi_i)$, which is a compact subset. Now $\mathcal{D}_\Omega \subset \cup_{i\in I, \xi_i \in \Lambda(\Gamma)} U(\xi_i)$ by the choice of $U(\xi_i)$'s. On the other hand, by [46, Proposition 5.1], we have $\Lambda(\Gamma) \cap \partial\mathcal{D} \subset \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$. Hence the claim follows. □

In the rest of this subsection, we fix $\xi \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma) \cap \partial(\tilde{S})$, and investigate $\mathcal{D}_\Omega \cap U(\xi)$. We consider the upper half space model for $\mathbb{H}^n$ and assume that $\xi = \infty$. In particular, $\tilde{S}$ is a vertical plane. Let Γ_∞, Γ', L and $C(L, r)$ be as in the subsection 4.2. Without loss of generality, we assume $0 \in L$. We consider the orthogonal decomposition $\mathbb{R}^{n-1} = L \oplus L^\perp$ and let $P_{L^\perp} : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to L^\perp$ denote the orthogonal projection map.

Lemma 4.8. *There exist* $R_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $h \in H_\Omega$, *we have* $\|P_{L^\perp}(h^+)\| \leq R_0$.

Proof. Let Ω_0 be a compact subset of G such that $\Omega = \Gamma\backslash\Gamma\Omega_0$. Then by Corollary 4.3, and part (1) of Theorem 4.2, there exists $R_0' > 0$ depending on Ω, such that

$$\text{if } x \in C(L, R_0') \cap \mathbb{H}^n, \text{ then } x \notin \Gamma\Omega_0. \tag{4.9}$$

Suppose now that $h \in H_\Omega$, thus $ha_{t_0}(o) \in \Gamma\Omega_0$ for some $t_0 > 0$. This, in view of (4.9) and the definition of $C(L, R_0')$, implies $d_{\mathrm{Euc}}(ha_{t_0}(o), L) < R_0'$.

As discussed above, $\{ha_t : t > 0\}$ is the geodesic ray emanating from $h(o)$ and orthogonal to $\tilde{S}$ i.e. a Euclidean semicircle orthogonal to the vertical plane. Hence there exists some absolute constant s_0 such that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} d_{\mathrm{Euc}}(ha_t(o), L) \leq d_{\mathrm{Euc}}(ha_{t_0}(o), L) + s_0 \leq R_0' + s_0,$$

which implies $\|P_{L^\perp}(h^+)\| \leq R_0 := R_0' + s_0$, as we wanted to show. □

For $N \geq 1$, set

$$U_N(\infty) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n_+ \cup \partial(\mathbb{R}^n_+) : \|x\|_{\mathrm{Euc}} > N\}. \tag{4.10}$$

Let $\Delta := \Gamma' \cap H$ and let r be the difference of the rank of Γ' and the rank of Δ. Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_r)$ be r-tuple of elements of Γ' such that the subgroup generated by $\gamma \cup \Delta$ has finite index in Γ'. For $\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ and γ, we write $\gamma^{\mathbf{k}} = \gamma_1^{k_1} \cdots \gamma_r^{k_r}$. The notation $|\mathbf{k}|$ means the maximum norm of $(k_1, \cdots, k_r)$.

The following gives a description of cuspidal neighborhoods of $\mathcal{D}_\Omega$:

Theorem 4.11. *There exist* $c_0 \geq 1$ *and a compact subset* $\mathcal{F}$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ *such that for all large* $N \gg 1$,

$$\{h^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} : \pi(h) \in \mathcal{D}_\Omega \cap U_{c_0 N}(\infty)\} \subset \cup_{|\mathbf{k}| \geq N} \Delta\gamma^{\mathbf{k}}\mathcal{F}.$$

Proof. In [46, Prop. 5.8], it is shown that for some $c_0 \geq 1$ and a compact subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$\{h^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma) : \mathcal{D} \cap U_{c_0 N}(\infty)\} \subset \cup_{|\mathbf{k}| \geq N} \Delta\gamma^{\mathbf{k}}\mathcal{F} \tag{4.12}$$

for all large $N \gg 1$. However the only property of $h^+ \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ used in this proof is the fact that $\sup_{x \in \Lambda(\Gamma)} \|P_{L^\perp}(x)\| < \infty$. Since this property holds for the set in concern by Lemma 4.8, the proof of Proposition 5.8 of [46] can be used. □

5. TRANSLATES OF A COMPACT PIECE OF $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ VIA THICKENING

Let Γ be a non-elementary geometrically finite subgroup of G. Let H be either symmetric or horospherical, and let $A = \{a_t\}$, M, K, $N^\pm$, o, X_0 be as in the subsection 4.1. Set $P := MAN^-$, which is the stabilizer of X_0^+.

5.1. **Measures on gH constructed from conformal densities.** Via the visual map $g \mapsto g^+$, we have $G/P \simeq \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$. Since $G/P \simeq K/M$, we may consider the visual map as a map from G to K/M. In both cases, the restriction of the visual map to H induces a diffeomorphism from $H/H \cap M$ to its image inside K/M.

Letting $\{\mu_x : x \in G/K\}$ be a Γ-invariant conformal density of dimension δ_μ, we will define a $H \cap M$-invariant measure $\tilde{\mu}_{gH}$ on each gH. Setting $\bar{H} = H/(H \cap M)$, First consider the measure on $g\bar{H}$:

$$d\tilde{\mu}_{g\bar{H}}(gh) = e^{\delta_\mu \beta_{(gh)^+}(o,gh)} d\mu_o((gh)^+).$$

We denote by $\tilde{\mu}_{gH}$ the $H \cap M$-invariant extension of this measure on gH, that is, for $f \in C_c(gH)$,

$$\int f(gh)\, d\tilde{\mu}_{gH}(gh) = \int_{g\bar{H}} \int_{H \cap M} f(ghm) d\tilde{\mu}_{g\bar{H}}(gh) d_{H \cap M}(m)$$

where $d_{H\cap M}(m)$ is the probability Haar measure on $H \cap M$.

By the Γ-invariant conformality of $\{\mu_x\}$, this definition is independent of $o \in \mathbb{H}^n$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{gH}$ is invariant under Γ and hence if $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma gH$ is closed, $\tilde{\mu}_{gH}$ induces a locally finite Borel measure μ_{gH} on $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma gH$.

Recall the Lebesgue density $\{m_x\}$ of dimension $n-1$ and the Patterson-Sullivan density $\{\nu_x\}$ of dimension δ. We normalize them so that $|m_o| = |\nu_o| = 1$. We set

$$\tilde{\mu}_{gH}^{\mathrm{Haar}} = \tilde{m}_{gH} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_{gH}^{\mathrm{PS}} = \tilde{\nu}_{gH},$$

and for a closed orbit $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma gH$, we denote by μ_{gH}^{Haar} and μ_{gH}^{PS} the measures on $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma gH$ induced by them respectively.

5.2. **Decomposition of measures.**

Lemma 5.1. *For each $g \in G$, $d\tilde{\mu}_{gH}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(gh) = d\tilde{\mu}_{H}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(h)$ and $dh := d\tilde{\mu}_{H}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(h)$ is a Haar measure on H.*

Proof. As m_o is G-invariant, we have

$$dm_o((gh)^+) = dm_{g^{-1}(o)}(h^+) = e^{(n-1)\beta_{h^+}(o,g^{-1}(o))} dm_o(h^+).$$

Since

$$\beta_{h^+}(o, g^{-1}(o)) + \beta_{(gh)^+}(o, gh) = \beta_{h^+}(o, g^{-1}(o)) + \beta_{h^+}(g^{-1}(o), h) = \beta_{h^+}(o, h),$$

we have

$$d\tilde{\mu}_{gH}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(gh) = e^{(n-1)\beta_{(gh)^+}(o,gh)} d\mu_o((gh)^+) = e^{(n-1)\beta_{h^+}(o,h)} d\mu_o(h^+) = d\tilde{\mu}_{H}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(h)$$

proving the first claim. The first claim shows that $d\tilde{\mu}_{\bar{H}}$ is left H-invariant. Since $d_{H\cap M}$ is an $H \cap M$-invariant measure, the product measure $d\tilde{\mu}_H(hm) = d\tilde{\mu}_{\bar{H}} h d_{H\cap M}(m)$ is a Haar measure of H. $\square$

The measure

$$dn_0 = e^{(n-1)\beta_{n_0^-}(o,n_0)} dm_o(n_0^-)$$

can be seen to be a Haar measure on N^- by the same argument as in Lemma 5.1. Then for $p = n_0 a_t m$,

$$dp := dn_0 dt dm$$

is a right invariant measure on $P = MAN^-$ where dm is the probability Haar measure of M and dt is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

For $g \in G$, consider the measure on gP given by

$$d\nu_{gP}(gp) = e^{\delta t} d\nu_o((gp)^-)dt \quad \text{for} \quad t = \beta_{(gp)^{-1}}(o, gp). \tag{5.2}$$

For $\Psi \in C_c(G)$, we have:

$$\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(\Psi) = \int_{gP} \int_N \Psi(gpn) dn\, dp; \tag{5.3}$$

$$\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) = \int_{gP} \int_N \Psi(gpn) d\tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{Haar}}_{gpN}(gpn) d\nu_{gP}(gp); \tag{5.4}$$

$$\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi) = \int_{gP} \int_N \Psi(gpn) d\tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{PS}}_{gpN}(gpn) d\nu_{gP}(gp). \tag{5.5}$$

5.3. **Approximations of Ψ.** We fix a left invariant metric d on G, which is right $H \cap M$-invariant and which descends to the hyperbolic metric on $\mathbb{H}^n = G/K$. For a subset S of G and $\epsilon > 0$, S_ϵ denotes the ϵ-neighborhood of e in S: $S_\epsilon = \{g \in S : d(g, e) \le \epsilon\}$.

We fix a compact subset Ω of $\Gamma\backslash G$. Let $r_0 := r_\Omega$ denote the infimum of the injectivity radius over all $x \in \Omega$. That is, for all $x \in \Omega$, the map $g \mapsto xg$ in injective on the set $\{g \in G : d(g, e) < r_\Omega\}$.

We fix a function $\kappa_\Omega \in C^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)$ such that $0 \le \kappa_\Omega \le 1$, $\kappa_\Omega(x) = 1$ and $\kappa_\Omega(x) = 0$ for x outside r_0-neighborhood of Ω.

For all small $\epsilon > 0$, set

$$\Psi^+_\epsilon(x) = \sup_{g \in G_\epsilon} \Psi(xg) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi^-_\epsilon(x) = \inf_{g \in G_\epsilon} \Psi(xg).$$

Then for each $0 < \epsilon \le r_\Omega$, $x \in \Gamma\backslash G$ and $g \in G_\epsilon$, we have

$$\Psi^-_\epsilon(x) \le \Psi(xg) \le \Psi^+_\epsilon(x) \tag{5.6}$$

and

$$|\Psi^\pm_\epsilon(x) - \Psi(x)| \le c_1 \epsilon \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi) \kappa_\Omega(x)$$

for some absolute constant $c_1 > 0$.

For $\bullet = \mathrm{Haar}, \mathrm{BR}$ or BMS, we define

$$A^\bullet_\Psi = \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi) \cdot m^\bullet(\mathrm{supp}(\Psi)).$$

Define $\phi_0(g) = |\nu_{g(o)}|$ for $g \in G$. Then ϕ_0 is left Γ-invariant and right K-invariant, and hence induces a smooth function in $C^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)^K = C^\infty(\mathbb{H}^n)$. Moreover ϕ_0 is an eigenfunction of the Laplacian with eigenvalue $\delta(n-1-\delta)$ [56].

Lemma 5.7. *For a compact subset Ω of $\Gamma\backslash G$,*

(1) $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Omega) \ll \sup_{x \in \Omega} \phi_0(x) \cdot m^{\mathrm{Haar}}(\Omega K)$;

(2) $m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Omega) \ll \sup_{x\in\Omega} \phi_0(x) \cdot m^{\mathrm{Haar}}(\Omega K)$;
(3) $m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Omega) \ll \sup_{x\in\Omega} \phi_0(x)^2 \cdot m^{\mathrm{Haar}}(\Omega K)$.

Proof. The first two claims follow since for any K-invariant function ψ in $\Gamma\backslash G$, $m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi) = m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi) = \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \psi(g)\phi_o(g)dm^{\mathrm{Haar}}(g)$. The third one follows from the smearing argument of Sullivan, see [56, cf. Proof of Prop. 5]. ☐

On the other hand, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)$ [1]. Hence it follows from Lemma 5.7 that there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$, any $\bullet = \mathrm{Haar}, \mathrm{BR}, \mathrm{BR}_*$ or BMS, and any $0 < \epsilon < r_\Omega$,

$$A_\Psi^\bullet \ll \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi) \cdot m^{\mathrm{Haar}}(\mathrm{supp}(\Psi)) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_\epsilon^\pm) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi) \tag{5.8}$$

where the implied constants depend only on Ω.

5.4. **Thickening.** For the rest of this section, fix $y \in \Gamma\backslash G$ and $H_0 \subset H$ be a compact subset such that the map $h \mapsto yh$ is injective on H_0. Fix $0 < \epsilon_0 < r_\Omega$ which is smaller than the injectivity radius of yH_0.

Fix a non-negative function $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in C^\infty(yH_0)$. Let $M' \subset M$ be a smooth cross section for $H \cap M$ in M and set $P' := M'AN^-$. As $hp = h'p'$ implies $h = h'm$ and $p = m^{-1}p'$ for $m \in H \cap M$, it follows that the product map $H \times P' \to G$ is a diffeomorphism onto its image, which is a Zariski open neighborhood of e. Let dp' be a smooth measure on P' such that $dp = dp' d_{H\cap M} m$ for $p = p'm$. For $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, let $\rho_\epsilon \in C^\infty(P'_\epsilon)$ be a non-negative function such that $\int \rho_\epsilon dp' = 1$, and we define $\Phi_\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma\backslash G)$ by

$$\Phi_\epsilon(g) = \begin{cases} \phi(yh)\rho_\epsilon(p) & \text{if } g = yhp \in yH_0P'_\epsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5.9}$$

Lemma 5.10. *For all* $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ *and* $t > 0$,

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi_\epsilon^-(ga_t)\Phi_\epsilon(g)dg \le \int_{h\in H_0} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)dh \le \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi_\epsilon^+(ga_t)\Phi_\epsilon(g)dg.$$

Proof. For all $p \in P'_\epsilon$, $h \in H_0$ and $t > 0$, $yhpa_t = yha_t(a_{-t}pa_t) \in yha_tP_\epsilon$ and hence

$$\int_{h\in H_0} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)dh \le \int_{h\in H_0} \Psi_\epsilon^+(yhpa_t)\phi(yh)dh.$$

Integrating against ρ_ϵ, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{h\in H_0} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)dh \\ \le &\int_{yhp\in yH_0P'_\epsilon} \Psi_\epsilon^+(yhpa_t)\phi(yh)\rho_\epsilon(p')dhdp' \\ &= \int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi_\epsilon^+(ga_t)\Phi_\epsilon(g)dg. \end{aligned}$$

The other direction is proved similarly. ☐

Lemma 5.11. *For all* $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$,

$$m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Phi_\epsilon) = (1 + O(\epsilon))\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi).$$

Proof. Choose $g_y \in G$ so that $y = \Gamma\backslash\Gamma g_y$ and set $\tilde\phi(g_y h) := \phi(yh)$ and $\tilde\Phi_\epsilon(g_y hp) := \tilde\phi(yh)\rho_\epsilon(p)$ for $hp \in H_0 P'_\epsilon$ and zero otherwise. As $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$, we have $m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Phi_\epsilon) = \tilde m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\tilde\Phi_\epsilon)$ and $\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) = \tilde\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tilde\phi)$. By the definition, we have

$$\tilde m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\tilde\Phi_\epsilon) = \int_{g\in G/M}\int_M \tilde\Phi_\epsilon(gm)dm\, e^{\delta\beta_{g^+}(o,g)}\, e^{(n-1)\beta_{g^-}(o,g)}\, d\nu_o(g^+)dm_o(g^-)ds$$

where $s = \beta_{g^-}(o, g)$. For simplicity, we set $g_y = y \in G$ by abuse of notation. For $g = yhp \in H_0 P'_\epsilon$, as $|\beta_{g^+}(yh, g)| \le d(yh, yhp) = d(e, p) \le \epsilon$, we have $e^{\delta\beta_{g^+}(yh,g)} = 1 + O(\epsilon)$. Since $g^+ = (yh)^+$, we have

$$e^{\delta\beta_{g^+}(o,g)}d\nu_o(g^+) = (1+O(\epsilon))e^{\delta\beta_{(yh)^+}(o,yh)}d\nu_o((yh)^+) = (1+O(\epsilon))d\tilde\mu_{y\tilde H}^{\mathrm{PS}}(yh).$$

On the other hand, as $\{m_x\}$ is G-invariant,

$$dm_o(g^-) = dm_{(yh)^{-1}(o)}(p^-) = e^{(n-1)\beta_{p^-}(o,(yh)^{-1}(o))}dm_o(p^-).$$

Since $\beta_{g^-}(o, g)+\beta_{p^-}(o, (yh)^{-1}(o)) = \beta_{p^-}((yh)^{-1}(o), p)+\beta_{p^-}(o, (yh)^{-1}(o)) = \beta_{p^-}(o, p)$. Since for $p = n_0 a_t m$, $p^- = n_0^-$, we have

$$\beta_{p^-}(o, p) = \beta_{n_0^-}(o, n_0 a_t) = \beta_{X_0^-}(o, a_t) + \beta_{n_0^-}(o, n_0) = -t + \beta_{n_0^-}(o, n_0).$$

Since $n_0 a_t m \in P_\epsilon$, $e^{-(n-1)t} = 1 + O(\epsilon)$ and hence

$$e^{(n-1)\beta_{g^-}(o,g)}dm_o(g^-)dsdm = e^{-(n-1)t}dn_0dtdm = (1 + O(\epsilon))dp.$$

Since $dp = d_{H\cap M}(m)dp'$ for $p = mp'$, for $\overline\phi(yh) := \int_{H\cap M}\tilde\phi(yhm)d_{H\cap M}(m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\tilde\Phi_\epsilon) &= (1 + O(\epsilon))\int_{P'_\epsilon}\int_{yh\in yH_0/(H\cap M)} \overline\phi(yh)\rho_\epsilon(p')d\tilde\mu_{y\tilde H}^{\mathrm{PS}}(yh)dp' \\ &= (1 + O(\epsilon))\tilde\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tilde\phi).\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 5.12. *There exists* $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ *such that for any* $\phi \in C^\infty(yH_0)$, $\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)$ *where the implied constant depends only on the compact subset* yH_0.

Proof. By Lemmas 5.11 and 5.7, there exists $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) \ll m_*^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Phi_{\epsilon_0}) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_{\ell_0}) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\rho_{\epsilon_0}) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi).$$

where the implied constants depending only on ϵ_0 and yH_0. □

Theorem 5.13. *There exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$ such that for any $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in C^\infty(yH_0)$, we have*

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t} \int_{yh \in yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)dh \\ = \frac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi)\tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{PS}}_{yH}(\phi) + e^{-\eta_0 t} O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)),$$

with the implied constant depending on Ω and yH_0.

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim for Ψ and ϕ non-negative. Let $\ell \geq 1$ be bigger than those ℓ's in Theorem 3.28, (5.8) and Corollary 5.12. Let $q_\ell > 0$ (depending only on the dimension of P') be such that $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\rho_\epsilon) = O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell})$, so that

$$\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Phi_\epsilon) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\rho_\epsilon)) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\epsilon^{-q_\ell}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi^\pm_\epsilon) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)$ and that $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi^\pm_\epsilon) = m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) + O(\epsilon A^{\mathrm{BR}}_\Psi)$. By Lemma 5.10,

$$\langle a_t\Psi^-_\epsilon, \Phi_\epsilon\rangle \leq \int_{yh\in yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)dh \leq \langle a_t\Psi^+_\epsilon, \Phi_\epsilon\rangle.$$

By Lemma 5.11 and Theorem 3.28, there exists $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\langle a_t\Psi^\pm_\epsilon, \Phi_\epsilon\rangle \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi^\pm_\epsilon) m^{\mathrm{BR}}_*(\Phi_\epsilon) + e^{-\eta t} O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\epsilon^{-q_\ell}) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi)\tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{PS}}_{yH}(\phi) + O(\epsilon A^{\mathrm{BR}}_\Psi \tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{PS}}_{yH}(\phi)) + e^{-\eta t} O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\epsilon^{-q_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

By taking $\epsilon = e^{-\eta t/(1+q_\ell)}$ and $\eta_0 = \eta/(1+q_\ell)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{(n-1-\delta)t} \int_{yh\in yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)dh \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi)\tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{PS}}_{yH}(\phi) + e^{-\eta_0 t} O(A^{\mathrm{BR}}_\Psi \tilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{PS}}_{yH}(\phi) + \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)). \end{aligned}$$

By (5.8) and Corollary 5.12, this proves the theorem. □

We remark that we don't need to assume yH is closed in the above theorem, as ϕ is assumed to be compactly supported.

6. DISTRIBUTION OF $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma Ha_t$ AND TRANSVERSAL INTERSECTIONS

Let $\Gamma, H, A = \{a_t\}$, $P = MAN^-$, etc be as in the last section 5. We set $N = N^+$. Let $\{\mu_x\}$ be a Γ-invariant conformal density of dimension $\delta_\mu > 0$ and let $\tilde{\mu}_{gH}$ and $\tilde{\mu}_{gN}$ be the measures on gH and gN respectively defined with respect to $\{\mu_x\}$.

6.1. **Transversal intersections.** Fix $x \in \Gamma\backslash G$. Let $\epsilon_0 > 0$ be the injectivity radius at x. In particular, the product map $P_{\epsilon_0} \times N_{\epsilon_0} \to \Gamma\backslash G$ given by $(p, n) \mapsto xpn$ is injective. For any $\epsilon \le \epsilon_0$ we set $B_\epsilon := P_\epsilon N_\epsilon$.

Since for some $c_1 > 1$, we have $N_{c_1^{-1}\epsilon} P_{c_1^{-1}\epsilon} \subset B_\epsilon := P_\epsilon N_\epsilon \subset N_{c_1\epsilon} P_{c_1\epsilon}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, in the arguments below, we will frequently identify B_ϵ with $N_\epsilon P_\epsilon$, up to a fixed Lipschitz constant.

In the next lemma, let $\Psi \in C_c^\infty(xB_{\epsilon_0})^{H\cap M}$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(yH)^{H\cap M}$. For $0 < \epsilon \le \epsilon_0$, define $\psi_\epsilon^\pm \in C^\infty(xP)^{H\cap M}$ by

$$\psi_\epsilon^\pm(xp) = \int_{xpN} \Psi_\epsilon^\pm(xpn)\, d\mu_{xpN}(xpn)$$

and define $\phi_\epsilon^\pm \in C_c^\infty(yH)^{H\cap M}$ by

$$\phi_\epsilon^+(yh) = \sup_{h' \in H_\epsilon} \phi(yhh') \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_\epsilon^-(yh) = \inf_{h' \in H_\epsilon} \phi(yhh'). \tag{6.1}$$

The following lemma is analogous to Corollary 2.14 in [46]; however we are here working in $\Gamma\backslash G$ rather than in $\mathrm{T}^1(\Gamma\backslash\mathbb{H}^n)$ as opposed to [46]. Let

$$P_x(t) := \{p \in P_{\epsilon_0}/(H\cap M) : \operatorname{supp}(\phi)a_t \cap xpN_{\epsilon_0}(H\cap M) \ne \emptyset\}.$$

Lemma 6.2. *Then for any $0 < \epsilon \ll \epsilon_0$, we have*

$$(1 - c\epsilon) \sum_{p \in P_x(t)} \phi^-_{ce^{-t}\epsilon_0}(xpa_{-t}) \psi^-_{c\epsilon}(xp) \le e^{\delta_\mu t} \int_{yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)\, d\mu_{yH}(yh)$$

$$\le (1 + c\epsilon) \sum_{p \in P_x(t)} \phi^+_{ce^{-t}\epsilon_0}(xpa_{-t}) \psi^+_{c\epsilon}(xp),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, depending only on the injectivity radii of $\operatorname{supp}(\phi)$ *and* $\operatorname{supp}(\Psi)$*.*

Proof. By considering a smooth partition of unity for the support of ϕ, it suffices to prove the lemma assuming $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subsetneq yN_\epsilon P_\epsilon \cap yH \subset yB_\epsilon$. Fix $g, g' \in G$ so that $y = \Gamma g$ and $x = \Gamma g'$. Then for $\bar{H} = H/H \cap M$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)\, d\mu_{yH}(yh) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in (\Gamma\cap gHg^{-1})\backslash\Gamma} \int_{\gamma gH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)\, d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma gH}(\gamma gh) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in (\Gamma\cap gHg^{-1})\backslash\Gamma} \int_{\gamma g\bar{H}} \int_{H\cap M} \Psi(yha_t m)\, dm\ \phi(yhm)\, d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma g\bar{H}}(\gamma gh) \\
&= \sum_{\gamma \in (\Gamma\cap gHg^{-1})\backslash\Gamma} \int_{\gamma g\bar{H}} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)\ d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma g\bar{H}}(\gamma gh)
\end{aligned}$$

as dm is the probability Haar measure of $H\cap M$.

Suppose $yh \in \mathrm{supp}(\phi) \cap yH$, and write $h = n_h p_h$ where $n_h \in N_\epsilon$ and $p_h \in P_\epsilon$. As $h^+ = n_h^+$ and $d(h, n_h) = O(\epsilon)$, we have that for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$

$$\frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma g\bar{H}}(\gamma gh)}{d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma gN}(\gamma g n_h)} = 1 + O(\epsilon). \tag{6.3}$$

Let $\gamma \in (\Gamma \cap gHg^{-1})\backslash\Gamma$. If $\gamma gha_t = g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t} \in g' P_{\epsilon_0} N_{\epsilon_0}$, then we claim that

$$e^{\delta_\mu t} \frac{d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma gN}(\gamma g n_h)}{d\tilde{\mu}_{g' p_{h,t} N}(g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t})} = O(e^\epsilon). \tag{6.4}$$

Note that $\gamma gha_t = g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t}$ implies $\gamma g n_h a_t = g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t} (a_t^{-1} p_h a_t)$. Hence $\xi := (\gamma g n_h)^+ = (g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t})^+$, and for $p'_{h,t} := (a_t^{-1} p_h a_t) \in P_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\beta_\xi(o, \gamma g n_h) = \beta_\xi(o, g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t}) + \beta_\xi(g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t}, g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t} p'_{h,t}) \\ &+ \beta_\xi(g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t} p'_{h,t}, g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t} p'_{h,t} a_{-t}) = \beta_\xi(o, g' p_{h,t} n_{h,t}) + O(\epsilon) - t, \end{aligned}$$

proving the claim (6.4).

Note that xB_{ϵ_0} is the disjoint union $\cup_{p \in P_{\epsilon_0}} xpN_{\epsilon_0}$. Since $n_{h,t} \in N_{\epsilon_0}$ and $\gamma gh = g' p_{h,t} a_{-t} (a_t n_{h,t} a_{-t})$ with $a_t n_{h,t} a_{-t} \in N_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0}$, in view of (6.3) and (6.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{\delta_\mu t} \int_{\gamma g\bar{H}} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh) d\tilde{\mu}_{\gamma g\bar{H}}(\gamma gh) \\ &= (1 + O(\epsilon)) \sum_p \phi^+_{ce^{-t}\epsilon_0}(xpa_{-t}) \cdot \int_{g'pN} \Psi^+_{c\epsilon}(xpn) d\tilde{\mu}_{g'pN}(g'pn) \\ &= (1 + O(\epsilon)) \sum_p \phi^+_{ce^{-t}\epsilon_0}(xpa_{-t}) \cdot \psi^+_{c\epsilon}(xp) \end{aligned}$$

where the both sums are taken over the set of $p \in P_{\epsilon_0}/(H \cap M)$ such that $\gamma g H_\epsilon a_t \cap g' p N_{\epsilon_0}(H \cap M) \neq \emptyset$ and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Summing over $\gamma \in (\Gamma \cap gHg^{-1})\backslash\Gamma$, we obtain one side of the inequality and the other side follows if one argues similarly for Ψ^-_ϵ. □

By a similar argument, we can prove the following:

Lemma 6.5. *Let $\phi \in C_c(yH)^{H \cap M}$ and $\psi \in C^\infty(xP_{\epsilon_0})^{H \cap M}$. Assume that $\mu_{xpN}(xpN_{\epsilon_0}) > 0$ for all $p \in P_{\epsilon_0}$. There exists $c > 1$ such that for all small $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - c\epsilon) \int_{yH} \Psi^-_{c\epsilon}(yha_t)\phi^-_{ce^{-t}\epsilon_0}(yh) d\mu_{yH}(yh) &\leq e^{-\delta_\mu t} \sum_{p \in P_x(t)} \psi(xp)\phi(xpa_{-t}) \\ &\leq (1 + c\epsilon) \int_{yH} \Psi^+_{c\epsilon}(yha_t)\phi^+_{ce^{-t}\epsilon_0}(yh) d\mu_{yH}(yh) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Psi \in C^\infty(xB_{\epsilon_0})$ is defined by $\Psi(xpn) = \frac{1}{\mu_{xpN}(xpN_{\epsilon_0})}\psi(xp)$ for each $pn \in P_{\epsilon_0} N_{\epsilon_0}$.

Similarly to the definitions of $A^{\bullet}_{\Psi}$, we define for $\phi \in C(yH)$,

$$A_\phi^{\mathrm{PS}} := \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\phi) \cdot \mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\operatorname{supp}(\phi)),$$

and for $\psi \in C(xP_{\epsilon_0})$,

$$A_\psi^{\nu} := \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\psi)\nu_{xP}(\operatorname{supp}(\psi))$$

where ν_{xP} is defined as in (5.2).

By a similar argument as in the proofs of Lemma 5.8 and 5.12, we have $A_\phi^{\mathrm{PS}} \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)$ and $A_\psi^\nu \leq \mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 6.6. *Let $\psi \in C(xP_{\epsilon_0})^{H\cap M}$. For $\Psi \in C^\infty(xB_{\epsilon_0})^{H\cap M}$ given by $\Psi(xpn) = \frac{1}{\mu_{xpN}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(xpN_{\epsilon_0})}\psi(xp)$, we have*

$$m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) = \nu_{xP}(\psi) \quad \text{ and } \quad A_\Psi^{\mathrm{BR}} \ll A_\psi^\nu .$$

Proof. For $g = xpn$, we have $g^- = (xp)^-$ and $\beta_{(xp)^-}(o, xpn) = \beta_{(xp)^-}(o, xp)$. Based on this, the claims follow from the definition. The second claim follows from $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\operatorname{supp}(\Psi)) = \nu_{xP}(\operatorname{supp}(\psi))$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi) \ll_{\epsilon_0} \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\psi)$. □

In the rest of this section, we assume that $\delta > (n-1)/2$; in particular, Theorem 5.13 holds.

Theorem 6.7. *There exist $\beta > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $0 < \epsilon \ll \epsilon_0$ and any $\psi \in C^\infty(xP_{\epsilon_0})^{H\cap M}$, and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(yH)^{H\cap M}$, we have*

$$e^{-\delta t} \sum_{p\in P_x(t)} \psi(xp)\phi(xpa_{-t}) = \frac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\nu_{xP}(\psi)\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) + e^{-\beta t} O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)),$$

where $P_x(t) := \{p \in P_{\epsilon_0}/(H\cap M) : \operatorname{supp}(\phi)a_t \cap xpN_{\epsilon_0}(H\cap M) \neq \emptyset\}$ and the implied constant depends only on the injectivity radii of $\operatorname{supp}(\psi)$ *and* $\operatorname{supp}(\phi)$.

Proof. Define $\Psi_\epsilon^\pm(xpn) = \frac{1}{\mu_{xpN}^{\mathrm{Haar}}(xpN_\epsilon)}\psi_\epsilon^\pm(xp)$. Then $m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi^\pm) = \nu_{xP}(\psi^\pm)$ by Lemma 6.6.

We take ℓ big enough to satisfy Theorem 5.13, Corollary 5.12 and that $A_\Psi^{\mathrm{BR}} \ll A_\psi^\nu \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)$ and $A_\phi^{\mathrm{PS}} \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)$.

By Theorem 5.13, for some $\eta_0 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{yH} \Psi_\epsilon^\pm(yha_t)\phi^\pm_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0}(yh)dh \\
&= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi_\epsilon^\pm)\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi^\pm_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0}) + e^{-\eta_0 t} O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi_\epsilon^\pm)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi^\pm_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0})) \\
&= m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi)\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) + O((\epsilon + e^{-t})A_\Psi^{\mathrm{BR}}A_\phi^{\mathrm{PS}}) + e^{-\eta_0 t}O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)) \\
&= \nu_{xP}(\psi)\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) + O((e^{-\eta_0 t} + \epsilon)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the claim now follows by applying Lemma 6.5 for $d\mu_{yH}(yh) = dh$ and $\delta_\mu = n-1$ with $\beta = \eta_0/2$ and $\epsilon = e^{-\eta_0 t/2}$. □

Using Theorem 6.7, we now prove the following theorem, which is analogous to Theorem 5.13 with dh replaced by $d\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(yh)$. Translates of $d\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{Haar}}$ and $d\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}$ on yH are closely related as their transversals are essentially the same. More precisely, Theorem 6.7 provides a link between translates of these two measures.

Theorem 6.8. *There exist $\beta > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\Psi \in C^\infty(xB_{\epsilon_0})^{H\cap M}$ and $\phi \in C_c^\infty(yH)^{H\cap M}$,*

$$\int_{yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)d\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(yh) = \frac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) + O(e^{-\beta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)).$$

Proof. Define $\psi \in C^\infty(xP_{\epsilon_0})^{H\cap M}$ by

$$\psi(xp) = \int_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}} \Psi(xpn)d\mu_{xpN}^{\mathrm{PS}}(xpn).$$

We apply Theorem 6.7 and Lemma 6.2 for the Patterson-Sullivan density $\{\mu_x\}$ and with this ψ. First note that it follows from the definitions (see (5.5)) that $\nu_{xP}(\psi) = m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)$ and $A_\psi^\nu \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)$ for some $\ell \geq 1$. We take ℓ large enough to satisfy Theorem 6.7 and the last inequality.

Let β be as in Theorem 6.7 and let $\epsilon = e^{-\beta t}$. Now by Lemma 6.2, we get

$$\int_{yH} \Psi(yha_t)\phi(yh)d\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(yh) = (1+O(\epsilon))e^{-\delta t} \sum_{p\in P_x(t)} \phi^{\pm}_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0}(xpa_{-t})\psi^{\pm}_{\epsilon}(xp).$$

By Theorem 6.7,

$$\begin{aligned} &e^{-\delta t} \sum_{p\in P_x(t)} \phi^{\pm}_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0}(xpa_{-t})\psi^{\pm}_{\epsilon}(xp) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\nu_{xP}(\psi^{\pm}_{\epsilon})\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi^{\pm}_{e^{-t}\epsilon_0}) + e^{-\beta t}O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\nu_{xP}(\psi)\mu_{yH}^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi) + O(\epsilon + e^{-\beta t})(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\nu_{xP}(\psi) = m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)$ and $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi), A_\psi^\nu \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)$, this finishes the proof. □

6.2. **Effective equidistribution of $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma Ha_t$.** We now extend Theorems 5.13 and 6.8 to bounded functions $\phi \in C^\infty((\Gamma\cap H)\backslash H)$ which are not necessarily compactly supported. Hence the goal is to establish the following: assume that the orbit $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ is closed as well as that $\delta > (n-1)/2$. Set $\Gamma_H := \Gamma \cap H$.

Theorem 6.9. *Suppose that $|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}| < \infty$. There exist $\beta > 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$ such that for any compact subset $\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash G$, for any $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ and any bounded $\phi \in C^\infty(\Gamma_H\backslash H)$, we have, as $t \to +\infty$,*

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H} \Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)dh = \frac{\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) + O(e^{-\beta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi))$$

where the implied constant depends only on Ω.

For the case of H horospherical, the support of μ_H^{PS} is compact and hence $|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}| < \infty$. Therefore, Theorem 6.9 follows from Theorem 4.4, in view of Theorem 5.13.

In the rest of this section, we assume that H is symmetric. Recall the notion of the parabolic-corank of Γ with respect to H, introduced in [46]:

$$r_0 := \text{Pb-corank}_H(\Gamma) := \max_{\xi\in\Lambda_p(\Gamma)\cap\partial(H)} (\mathrm{rank}(\Gamma_\xi) - \mathrm{rank}(\Gamma_\xi \cap H)) .$$

It is shown in [46]:

Proposition 6.10. *We have* $\text{Pb-corank}_H(\Gamma) = 0$ *if and only if the support of* μ_H^{PS} *is compact, and* $\text{Pb-corank}_H(\Gamma) < \delta$ *if and only if* μ_H^{PS} *is finite.*

We first deduce the following estimates from section 4: recall the notation $\mathcal{D}$ for a Dirichlet domain for the action of $H\cap\Gamma$ in $\tilde S = H(o)$. Fix a compact subset $\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash G$ and let $\mathcal{D}_\Omega$ be defined as (4.6). For $\xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$, let $U_N(\xi)$ be defined to be $g(U_N(\infty))$ where $g\in G$ is such that $\xi = g(\infty)$ and $U_N(\infty)$ defined as in (4.10).

Proposition 6.11. *Let* $\xi \in \partial(\tilde S)\cap\Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ *and* $r := \mathrm{rank}(\Gamma_\xi) - \mathrm{rank}(\Gamma_\xi\cap H)$. *For all* $N \gg 1$, *we have*

$$\tilde\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}\{h\in H : \pi(h)\in \mathcal{D}_\Omega\cap U_N(\xi)\} \ll N^{-\delta+r};$$
$$\tilde\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}}\{h\in H : \pi(h)\in \mathcal{D}_\Omega\cap U_N(\xi)\} \ll N^{-n+1+r}$$

with the implied constants independent of N.

Proof. The first claim is shown in [46, Proposition 5.2]. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\xi = \infty$. By replacing δ by $n-1$ and ν_o by m_o in the proof of [46, Proposition 5.2], we get

$$\int_{h^+\in\gamma^{\mathbf{k}}\mathcal{F}} e^{(n-1)\beta_{h^+}(o,h)} dm_o(h^+) \asymp |\mathbf{k}|^{-n+1}$$

where the notation γ, $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ are as in Theorem 4.11.

Hence by Proposition 4.11,

$$\tilde\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}}\{h\in H : \pi(h)\in\mathcal{D}_\Omega\cap U_N(\infty)\} \ll \sum_{\mathbf{k}\in\mathbb{Z}^r, |\mathbf{k}|\ge N} |\mathbf{k}|^{-n+1} \ll N^{-n+1+r}.$$

□

By Corollary 4.7, (4.12), Proposition 6.11, and by the structure of the support of μ_H^{PS} obtained in [46], we have the following:

Theorem 6.12. *There exists an open subset* $Y_\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ *containing the set* $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}) \cup \{h\in\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H : ha_t\in\Omega \text{ for some } t>0\}$ *and satisfying the following properties:*

1. *if we let* $Y_\epsilon := \{h\in Y_\Omega : r_h > \epsilon\}$ *where* r_h *denotes the injectivity radius at* $h\in\Gamma\backslash G$, *then* Y_ϵ *is a relatively compact subset;*
2. *there exist* $\xi_1,\cdots,\xi_m\in\Lambda_p(\Gamma)\cap\partial(H)$ *and* $c_1>0$ *such that for all small* $\epsilon>0$, $Y_\Omega - Y_\epsilon \subset \cup_{i=1}^m U_{c_1\epsilon^{-1}}(\xi_i)$;

(3) *for* $r_0 := \text{Pb-corank}_H(\Gamma)$ *and for all small* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\tilde{\mu}_H^{\text{PS}}(Y_\Omega - Y_\epsilon) \ll \epsilon^{\delta - r_0} \quad \textit{and} \quad \tilde{\mu}_H^{\text{Haar}}(Y_\Omega - Y_\epsilon) \ll \epsilon^{n-1-r_0}.$$

We first prove the following which is an analogous version of Theorem 6.9 for the μ_H^{PS} measure:

Theorem 6.13. *Suppose* $r_0 := \text{Pb-corank}_H(\Gamma) < \delta$. *There exist* $\beta_0 > 0$ *and* $\ell \geq 1$ *such that for any compact subset* $\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash G$, *for any* $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)^{H\cap M}$ *and for any bounded* $\phi \in C^\infty((\Gamma \cap H)\backslash H)^{H\cap M}$, *we have*

$$\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H} \Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h) = \frac{\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(\phi)}{|m^{\text{BMS}}|} m^{\text{BMS}}(\Psi) + O(e^{-\beta_0 t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)).$$

Proof. Fix $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough to satisfy Theorem 6.8, $A_\phi^{\text{PS}} \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)$ and $A_\Psi^{\text{BMS}} \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we choose $\tau_\epsilon \in C^\infty(Y_\Omega)$ which is an $H \cap M$-invariant smooth approximation of the set Y_ϵ; $0 \leq \tau_\epsilon \leq 1$, $\tau_\epsilon(x) = 1$ for $x \in Y_\epsilon$ and $\tau_\epsilon(x) = 0$ for $x \notin Y_{\epsilon/2}$; we refer to [3] for the construction of such τ_ϵ. Let $q_\ell \gg 1$ be such that $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_\epsilon) = O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell})$. Fix a compact subset Ω containing the support of Ψ. By the definition of Y_Ω, we may write the integral $\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H} \Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h)$ as the sum

$$\int_{\Gamma_H\backslash H} \Psi(ha_t)(\phi\cdot\tau_\epsilon)(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h) + \int_{Y_\Omega} \Psi(ha_t)(\phi - \phi\cdot\tau_\epsilon)(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h).$$

Note that by (3) of Theorem 6.12, we have $\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(Y_\Omega - Y_\epsilon) \ll \epsilon^{\delta-r_0}$ and hence $\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(\phi - \phi\cdot\tau_\epsilon) \ll A_\phi^{\text{PS}}\cdot\epsilon^{\delta-r_0} \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\epsilon^{\delta-r_0}$. Now by Theorem 6.8,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H} \Psi(ha_t)(\phi\cdot\tau_\epsilon)(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h)\\
&= \frac{\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(\phi\cdot\tau_\epsilon)}{|m^{\text{BMS}}|}m^{\text{BMS}}(\Psi) + O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell}e^{-\beta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi))\\
&= \frac{\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(\phi)}{|m^{\text{BMS}}|}m^{\text{BMS}}(\Psi) + O(A_\phi^{\text{PS}}A_\Psi^{\text{BMS}}\epsilon^{\delta-r_0}) + O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell}e^{-\beta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi))\\
&= \frac{\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(\phi)}{|m^{\text{BMS}}|}m^{\text{BMS}}(\Psi) + O((\epsilon^{\delta-r_0} + \epsilon^{-q_\ell}e^{-\beta t})\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{Y_\Omega} \Psi(ha_t)(\phi - \phi\cdot\tau_\epsilon)(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h)\\
&\qquad\qquad \ll \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\phi)\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(Y_\Omega - Y_\epsilon) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\epsilon^{\delta-r_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by combining these two estimates, and taking $\epsilon = e^{-\beta/(\delta-r_0+q_\ell)}$ and $\beta_0 := e^{-\beta(\delta-r_0)/(\delta-r_0+q_\ell)}$, we obtain

$$\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H} \Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)d\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(h) = \frac{\mu_H^{\text{PS}}(\phi)}{|m^{\text{BMS}}|}m^{\text{BMS}}(\Psi) + O(e^{-\beta_0 t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 6.9. We will divide the integration region into three different regions: compact part, thin part, intermediate range. The compact part is the region where we get the main term using Theorem 5.13. The quite thin region can be controlled using Theorem 6.12. However there is an intermediate range where we need some control. This is in some sense the main technical difference from the case where Γ is a lattice. We control the contribution from this range, using results proved in this section in particular by relating this integral to summation over the "transversal"; see Lemmas 6.2 and 6.5.

We use the notation from the proof of Theorem 6.13 Let $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_0$. Define Y_{ϵ_0} and Y_{ϵ_1} as above. As above we choose $\tau_{\epsilon_0} \in C^\infty(Y)$ which is a $H \cap M$-invariant smooth approximation of Y_{ϵ_0} and recall that $\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(Y_\Omega - Y_{\epsilon_0}) \ll \epsilon_0^{\delta - r_0}$ by (1) of Proposition 6.11.

We may write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H} &\Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)dh \\ &= \int_{\Gamma_H\backslash H}\Psi(ha_t)(\phi\cdot\tau_{\epsilon_0})(h)dh + \int_{Y_\Omega}\Psi(ha_t)(\phi - \phi\cdot\tau_{\epsilon_0})(h)dh.\end{aligned}$$

Then by Theorem 5.13 with $\eta_0 > 0$ therein and Theorem 6.12,

$$\begin{aligned}e^{(n-1-\delta)t}&\int_{\Gamma_H\backslash H}\Psi(ha_t)(\phi\cdot\tau_{\epsilon_0})(h)dh \\ &= \frac{\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\phi)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi) + (\epsilon_0^{\delta-r_0} + e^{-\eta_0 t}\epsilon_0^{-q_\ell})O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)).\end{aligned} \tag{6.14}$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 6.12, we have, for $\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_1} := \tau_{\epsilon_1} - \tau_{\epsilon_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{Y_\Omega}\Psi(ha_t)(\phi - \phi\cdot\tau_{\epsilon_0})(h)dh \\ &\ll \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\phi)\left(\int_{Y_\Omega}\Psi(ha_t)\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_1}(h)dh + \int_{Y_\Omega - Y_{\epsilon_1}}\Psi(ha_t)dh\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

Set $\overline{\Psi}(x) := \int_{H\cap M}\Psi(xm)dm$. Applying Lemma 6.2 for the Haar measure $d\mu_H^{\mathrm{Haar}} = dh$ and Lemma 6.5 for the PS measure μ_H^{PS}, and for the function

$\mathcal{T} := \mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_1}$, with the notation as in the proof of Theorem 6.7, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{Y_\Omega}\Psi(ha_t)\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_1}(h)dh\\
&\ll e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{Y_\Omega}\overline{\Psi}(ha_t)\mathcal{T}_{\epsilon_1}(h)dh\\
&\ll e^{-\delta t}\sum_{p\in P_e(t)}\overline{\psi}^+_{\epsilon_1}(xp)\mathcal{T}^+_{e^{-t}\epsilon_1}(xpa_{-t})\\
&\ll \int_{\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H}\overline{\Psi}^+_{\epsilon_1}(ha_t)\mathcal{T}^+_{e^{-t}\epsilon_1}(h)d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_H(h)\\
&\ll \mathcal{S}_{\infty,1}(\overline{\Psi})\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_H(Y_{\epsilon_1}-Y_{\epsilon_0}) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\epsilon_0^{\delta-r_0}. \qquad (6.16)
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.12 implies that

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{Y_\Omega-Y_{\epsilon_1}}\Psi(ha_t)dh \le \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\epsilon_1^{n-1+r_0}. \qquad (6.17)$$

Therefore by (6.14), (6.15),(6.16), and (6.17),

$$\begin{aligned}
&e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H}\Psi(ha_t)\phi(h)dh\\
&=\frac{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_H(\phi)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\Psi)+O(\epsilon_0^{\delta-r_0}+e^{-\eta_0 t}\epsilon_0^{-q_\ell}+e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\epsilon_1^{n-1-r_0})\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi).
\end{aligned}$$

Now take ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 by $\epsilon_0 = e^{-\eta_0 t/(\delta-r_0+q_\ell)}$, recalling $\delta > r_0$, and $\epsilon_1^{n-1-r_0} = \epsilon_0^{\delta-r_0}e^{(\delta-n+1)t}$. We get ensure that $\epsilon_1 < \epsilon_0$ by taking ℓ and hence q_ℓ big enough. Finally, we obtain the claim with $\beta := \eta_0(\delta-r_0)/(\delta-r_0+q_\ell)$. □

We can also prove an analogue of Theorem 6.9 with a_t replaced by a_{-t}, by following a similar argument step by step but using Corollary 3.32 in place of Theorem 3.28. Consider the $H\cap M$-invariant measure $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H,-}$ on $\Gamma_H\backslash H$ induced by the measure $e^{\delta\beta_{h^-}(o,\bar{h})}d\nu_o(h^-)$ on $\bar{H} = H/(H\cap M)$:

$$d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H,-}(hm) = e^{\delta\beta_{h^-}(o,\bar{h})}d\nu_o(h^-)d_{H\cap M}(m). \qquad (6.18)$$

Theorem 6.19. *Suppose that* $|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H,-}| < \infty$. *There exist* $\beta > 0$ *and* $\ell \ge 1$ *such that for any compact subset* Ω *in* $\Gamma\backslash G$, *any* $\Psi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$ *and any bounded* $\phi \in C^\infty(\Gamma_H\backslash H)$, *we have, as* $t \to +\infty$,

$$e^{(n-1-\delta)t}\int_{h\in\Gamma_H\backslash H}\Psi(ha_{-t})\phi(h)dh = \frac{\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H,-}(\phi)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}m^{\mathrm{BR}}_*(\Psi)+O(e^{-\beta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\phi))$$

where the implied constant depends only on Ω.

6.3. **Effective mixing of the BMS measure.** In this subsection we prove an effective mixing for the BMS measure:

Theorem 6.20. *There exist $\beta > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any compact subset $\Omega \subset \Gamma\backslash G$, and for any $\Psi, \Phi \in C^\infty(\Omega)$,*

$$\int_{\Gamma\backslash G} \Psi(ga_t)\Phi(g)dm^{\mathrm{BMS}}(g) = \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Phi) + O(e^{-\beta t}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Phi))$$

with the implied constant depending only on Ω.

Proof. Using a smooth partition of unity for Ω, it suffices to prove the claim for $\Phi \in C_c(xB_{\epsilon_0})$ for $x \in \Omega$, $B_{\epsilon_0} = P_{\epsilon_0}N_{\epsilon_0}$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ smaller than the injectivity radius of Ω.

By Theorem 6.8 with $H = N$ and for each $p \in P_{\epsilon_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}} \Psi(xpna_t)\Phi(xpn)d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xpN}(xpn) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xpN}(\Phi|_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}}) + e^{-\beta t}O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Phi|_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}})). \end{aligned}$$

for some $\beta > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. As

$$\int_{xP_{\epsilon_0}} \mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xpN}(\Phi|_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}})d\nu_{xP}(xp) = m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Phi),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{xB_{\epsilon_0}} \Psi(ga_t)\Phi(g)dm^{\mathrm{BMS}}(g) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} \int_{xp\in xP_{\epsilon_0}} \int_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}} \Psi(xpna_t)\Phi(xpn)d\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{xpN}(xpn)d\nu_{xP}(xp) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Psi)m^{\mathrm{BMS}}(\Phi) + O(e^{-\beta t})\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi)\cdot \int_{xP_{\epsilon_0}} \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Phi|_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}})d\nu_{xP}(xp). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_{xP_{\epsilon_0}} \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Phi|_{xpN_{\epsilon_0}})d\nu_{xP}(xp) \ll \mathcal{S}_\ell(\Phi)m^{\mathrm{BR}}(\operatorname{supp}\Phi) \ll_\Omega S_\ell(\Phi),$$

this finishes the proof. $\square$

7. Effective uniform counting

7.1. **The case when H is symmetric or horospherical.** Let $G, H, A = \{a_t : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, K etc be as in the section 5. Let Γ be a geometrically finite group with $\delta > (n-1)/2$. Suppose that $[e]\Gamma$ is discrete in $H\backslash G$, equivalently, $\Gamma\backslash\Gamma H$ is closed in $\Gamma\backslash G$. We assume that $|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_H| < \infty$, or equivalently, the parabolic co-rank of Γ with respect to H is smaller than δ. This last condition is satisfied if H is horospherical, or if $n-k < \delta$ when $H^\circ \simeq \mathrm{SO}(k,1)^\circ \times \mathrm{SO}(n-k)$.

In this section, we will obtain effective counting results from Theorem 6.9 with ϕ being the constant function 1 on $(\Gamma\cap H)\backslash\Gamma$.

As we need to keep track of the main term when varying Γ over its subgroups of finite index for our intended applications to affine sieve, we consider the following situation: let $\Gamma_0 < \Gamma$ be a subgroup of finite index with $\Gamma_0 \cap H = \Gamma \cap H$ and fix $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$. For a family $\mathcal{B}_T \subset H\backslash G$ of compact subsets, we would like to investigate $\#[e]\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T$.

Define a function $F_T := F_{\mathcal{B}_T}$ on $\Gamma_0\backslash G$ by

$$F_T(g) := \sum_{\gamma \in H\cap\Gamma\backslash\Gamma_0} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_T}([e]\gamma g)$$

where $\chi_{\mathcal{B}_T}$ denotes the characteristic function of $\mathcal{B}_T$. Note that

$$F_T(\gamma_0) = \#[e]\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T.$$

Denote by $\{\nu_x\}$ the Patterson-Sullivan density for Γ normalized so that $|\nu_o| = 1$. Clearly, $\{\nu_x\}$ is the unique PS density for Γ_0 with $|\nu_o| = 1$. Recall the Lebesgue density $\{m_x\}$ with $|m_o| = 1$.

Therefore if $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BMS}}$, $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ and $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{Haar}}$ are the BMS measure, the BR measure, the Haar measure on G, the corresponding measures $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BMS}}_{\Gamma_0}$, $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_{\Gamma_0}$ and $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{Haar}}_{\Gamma_0}$ on $\Gamma_0\backslash G$ are naturally induced from them. Therefore for each $\bullet = \mathrm{BMS}, \mathrm{BR}, \mathrm{Haar}$, $|\tilde{m}^{\bullet}_{\Gamma_0}| = [\Gamma : \Gamma_0] \cdot |\tilde{m}^{\bullet}_{\Gamma}|$. Since $H \cap \Gamma = H \cap \Gamma_0$, we have $|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma,H}| = |\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma_0,H}|$ and $|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma,H,-}| = |\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma_0,H,-}|$.

7.2. **Weak-convergence of counting function.** Fix $\psi \in C_c^\infty(G)$. For $k \in K$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$, define $\psi^k, \psi_\gamma \in C_c^\infty(G)$ by $\psi^k(g) = \psi(gk)$ and $\psi_\gamma(g) = \psi(\gamma g)$. Also define $\Psi, \Psi_\gamma \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma_0\backslash G)$ by

$$\Psi(g) := \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma_0} \psi(\gamma' g) \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi_\gamma(g) := \sum_{\gamma' \in \Gamma_0} \psi(\gamma\gamma' g).$$

For a function f on K, define a function $\psi *_K f$, or simply $\psi * f$, on G by

$$\psi * f(g) = \int_{k \in K} \psi(gk) f(k)\, dk.$$

For a subset $\mathcal{B} \subset H\backslash G$, define a function $f^{\pm}_{\mathcal{B}}$ on K by

$$f^{\pm}_{\mathcal{B}}(k) = \int_{a_{\pm t} \in \mathcal{B}k^{-1} \cap [e]A^{\pm}} e^{\delta t} dt.$$

We adopt the notation $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_{+} = \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ and $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_{-} = \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_{*}$ below.

Proposition 7.1. *There exists $\beta_1 > 0$ (depending only on a uniform spectral gap of Γ and Γ_0) such that for any $T \gg 1$, and any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\langle F_T, \Psi_\gamma \rangle$ is given by*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_H|}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi * f^{+}_{\mathcal{B}_T}) + O(\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta-\beta_1)t} \cdot \mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)) & \text{if } G = HA^+K \\ \sum \frac{|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H\pm}|}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}_{\pm}(\psi * f^{\pm}_{\mathcal{B}_T}) + O(\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta-\beta_1)|t|} \cdot \mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Recall that for the Haar measure $d\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{Haar}}g = dg$, we have for $g = ha_tk$, $dg = \rho(t)dhdtdk$ where $\rho(t) = e^{(n-1)|t|}(1 + O(e^{-\alpha_1|t|}))$ for some $\alpha_1 > 0$ (cf. [46]).

Setting $\kappa^{\pm}(\Gamma_0) := \frac{|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma_0,H^{\pm}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}_{\Gamma_0}|}$, we have $\kappa^{\pm}(\Gamma_0) = \frac{1}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]}\kappa^{\pm}(\Gamma)$. We will only prove the claim for the case $G = HA^+K$, as the other case can be deduced in a similar fashion, based on Theorem 6.19. We apply Theorem 6.9 and obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle F_T, \Psi_\gamma\rangle &= \int_{[e]a_tk\in\mathcal{B}_T}\left(\int_{(H\cap\Gamma)\backslash H}\Psi_\gamma(ha_tk)dh\right)\rho(t)dtdk\\ &= \kappa^+(\Gamma_0)\int_{[e]a_tk\in\mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta-n+1)t}m^{\mathrm{BR}}_{\Gamma_0}(\Psi^k_\gamma)\rho(t)dtdk\\ &+ \int_{[e]a_tk\in\mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta-n+1-\beta)t}\rho(t)dtdk\cdot O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\Psi))\\ &= \kappa^+(\Gamma_0)\int_{[e]a_tk\in\mathcal{B}_T} e^{\delta t}\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^k_\gamma)dtdk + O(\max_{a_t\in\mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta-\beta_1)t}\cdot\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi))\end{aligned}$$

where $\beta_1 = \min\{\beta, \alpha_1\}$.

By the left Γ-invariance of $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$, we have $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^k_\gamma) = \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^k)$. Hence

$$\int_{[e]a_tk\in\mathcal{B}_T} e^{\delta t}\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^k_\gamma)dtdk = \int_{k\in K}\int_{a_t\in\mathcal{B}_Tk^{-1}}\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^k)dtdk = \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi * f^+_{\mathcal{B}_T}).$$

This finishes the proof. $\square$

7.3. **Counting and the measure $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}$.** Define a measure $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}$ on $H\backslash G$: for $\phi \in C_c(H\backslash G)$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\phi) = \begin{cases}\frac{|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_H|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\int_{a_tk\in A^+K}\phi(a_tk)e^{\delta t}dtd\nu_o(k^{-1}) & \text{if } G = HA^+K\\ \sum\frac{|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{H,\pm}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\int_{a_{\pm t}k\in A^{\pm}K}\phi(a_{\pm t}k)e^{\delta t}dtd\nu_o(k^{-1}) & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases} \tag{7.2}$$

where ν_o is the right M-invariant measure on K, which projects to the PS-measure ν_o on $K/M = \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$. Observe that the measure $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}$ depends on Γ but is independent of the normalization of the PS-density.

In the rest of this section, we fix a left-invariant Riemannian metric d on G. For a subset S of G, we set $S_\epsilon = \{s \in S : d(s, e) < \epsilon\}$.

Theorem 7.3. *If $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset H\backslash G\}$ is effectively well-rounded with respect to Γ (see Def. 1.6), then there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ (depending only on a uniform spectral gap for Γ and Γ_0) such that for any $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$*

$$\#([e]\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T) = \tfrac{1}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]}\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta_0})$$

with the implied constant independent of Γ_0 and $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Let $\psi^\epsilon \in C^\infty(G)$ be an ϵ smooth approximation of e: $0 \le \psi^\epsilon \le 1$, $\operatorname{supp}(\psi^\epsilon) \subset G_\epsilon$ and $\int \psi^\epsilon dg = 1$. Set $\mathcal{B}^+_{T,\epsilon} := \mathcal{B}_T G_\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{B}^-_{T,\epsilon} := \cap_{g \in G_\epsilon} \mathcal{B}_T g$. It follows by (1.6)(1) that

$$\langle F_{\mathcal{B}^-_{T,\epsilon}}, \Psi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}} \rangle \le F_T(\gamma_0) \le \langle F_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,\epsilon}}, \Psi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}} \rangle.$$

Again, we will provide a proof only for the case $G = HA^+K$; the other case can be done similarly, based on Proposition 7.1. By Proposition 7.1, for $\kappa^+(\Gamma_0) := \frac{|\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma_0,H}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}_{\Gamma_0}|}$,

$$\langle F_{\mathcal{B}^\pm_{T,\epsilon}}, \Psi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}} \rangle = \kappa^+(\Gamma_0) \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^\epsilon * f_{\mathcal{B}^\pm_{T,\epsilon}}) + O(\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta - \beta_1)t} \epsilon^{-q_\ell}).$$

where q_ℓ is so that $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi^\epsilon) = O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell})$. For $g = a_r n k' \in ANK$, define $H(g) = r$ and $\kappa(g) = k'$.

Now, using the strong wave front property for ANK decomposition [21], and the definition 1.6, there exists $c > 1$ such that for any $g \in G_\epsilon$ and $T \gg 1$,

$$f_{\mathcal{B}^-_{T,c\epsilon}}(\kappa(k^{-1})) \le f_{\mathcal{B}_T}(\kappa(k^{-1}g)) \le f_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,c\epsilon}}(\kappa(k^{-1})).$$

We use the formula for $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ (cf. [46]):

$$d\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(k a_r n) = e^{-\delta r} dn dr d\nu_o(k)$$

and deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\kappa^+(\Gamma) \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^\epsilon * f_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,\epsilon}}) \\
&= \kappa^+(\Gamma) \int_{k' \in K} \int_{KAN} \psi^\epsilon(k a_r n k') f_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,\epsilon}}(k') e^{-\delta r} dk' dn dr d\nu_o(k) \\
&= \kappa^+(\Gamma) \int_{k \in K} \int_G \psi^\epsilon(kg) f_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,\epsilon}}(\kappa(g)) e^{(-\delta + (n-1))H(g)} dg d\nu_o(k) \\
&= \kappa^+(\Gamma) \int_{k \in K} \int_G \psi^\epsilon(g) f_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,\epsilon}}(\kappa(k^{-1}g)) e^{(-\delta + (n-1))H(k^{-1}g)} dg d\nu_o(k) \\
&\le \kappa^+(\Gamma) \int_{k \in K} \int_G \psi^\epsilon(g) f_{\mathcal{B}^+_{T,c\epsilon}}(k^{-1}) dg d\nu_o(k) \\
&= \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}^+_{T,c\epsilon}) = (1 + O(\epsilon^p)) \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T) \qquad (7.4)
\end{aligned}$$

since $\int \psi^\epsilon dg = 1$ and $\kappa^+(\Gamma) \int_{k \in K} f_{\mathcal{B}_T}(k^{-1}) d\nu_o(k) = \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)$.

Similarly,

$$\kappa^+(\Gamma) \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^\epsilon * f_{\mathcal{B}^-_{T,c\epsilon}}) = (1 + O(\epsilon^p)) \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T).$$

Since $\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta - \beta_1)t} \ll \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta}$ for some $\eta > 0$,

$$\#(\Gamma_0 \gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T) = \frac{1}{[\Gamma : \Gamma_0]} \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\epsilon^p \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)) + O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell} \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta}).$$

Hence by taking $\epsilon = \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^{-\eta/(p+q_\ell)}$ and $\eta_0 = -p\eta/(p+q_\ell)$, we complete the proof. □

7.4. **Effectively well-rounded families of $H\backslash G$.**

7.4.1. *Sectors.* For $\Omega \subset K$, we consider the following sector in $H\backslash G$:

$$S_T(\Omega) := [e]\{a_t : 0 \le t \le \log T\}\Omega.$$

In this subsection, we show that the family of sectors $\{S_T(\Omega) : T \gg 1\}$ is effectively well-rounded provided Ω is admissible in the following sense:

Definition 7.5. We will call a Borel subset $\Omega \subset K$ with $\nu_o(\Omega^{-1}) > 0$ *admissible* if there exists $0 < p \le 1$ such that for all small $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\nu_o(\Omega^{-1}K_\epsilon - \cap_{k\in K_\epsilon}\Omega^{-1}k) \ll \epsilon^p$$

with the implied constant depending only on Ω.

Lemma 7.6. *Any Borel subset $\Omega \subset K$ with $\nu_o(\Omega^{-1}) > 0$ is admissible if $\partial(\Omega^{-1}) \cap \Lambda(\Gamma) = \emptyset$.*

Proof. As $\partial(\Omega^{-1})$ and $\Lambda(\Gamma)$ are compact subsets, we can find $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that the ϵ_0-neighborhood of $\partial(\Omega^{-1})$ is disjoint from $\Lambda(\Gamma)$. Hence we can find $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that $\partial(\Omega^{-1})K_{\epsilon_1}$ is disjoint from $\Lambda(\Gamma)$; so $\nu_o(\partial(\Omega^{-1})K_{\epsilon_1}) = 0$. □

Proposition 7.7. *Let $\kappa_o := \max_{\xi\in\Lambda_p(\Gamma)}$ rank (ξ). If*

$$\delta > \max\{n-2, \frac{n-2+\kappa_0}{2}\},$$

then any Borel subset $\Omega \subset K$ such that $\nu_o(\Omega^{-1}) > 0$ and $\partial(\Omega^{-1})$ is piece-wise smooth is admissible.

Proof. Let $s_\xi = \{\xi_t : t \in [0,\infty)\}$ be a geodesic ray emanating from o toward ξ and let $b(\xi_t) \in \overline{\mathbb{H}}^n$ be the Euclidean ball centered at ξ whose boundary is orthogonal to s_ξ at ξ_t. Then by Sullivan [56], there exist a Γ-invariant collection of pairwise disjoint horoballs $\{\mathcal{H}_\xi : \xi \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)\}$ for which the following holds: there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that for any $\xi \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and for any $t > 0$,

$$c^{-1}e^{-\delta t}e^{d(\xi_t,\Gamma(o))(k(\xi_t)-\delta)} \le \nu_o(b(\xi_t)) \le ce^{-\delta t}e^{d(\xi_t,\Gamma(o))(k(\xi_t)-\delta)}$$

where $k(\xi_t)$ is the rank of ξ' if $\xi_t \in \mathcal{H}_{\xi'}$ for some $\xi' \in \Lambda_p(\Gamma)$ and δ otherwise.

Therefore, using $0 \le d(\xi_t, \Gamma(o)) \le t$, it follows that for any $\xi \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$ and $t > 1$,

$$\nu_o(b(\xi_t)) \ll \begin{cases} e^{(-2\delta+k(\xi_t))t} & \text{if } k(\xi_t) \ge \delta \\ e^{-\delta t} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7.8}$$

By standard computations in hyperbolic geometry, there exists $c_0 > 1$ such that $B(\xi, c_0^{-1}e^{-t}) \subset b(\xi_t) \subset B(\xi, c_0 e^{-t})$ where $B(\xi, r)$ denotes the Euclidean ball in $\partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$ of radius r. Hence it follows from (7.8) that if we set $\kappa_0 := \max_{\xi'\in\Lambda_p(\Gamma)}$ rank (ξ'), then for all small $\epsilon > 0$ and $\xi \in \Lambda(\Gamma)$,

$$\nu_o(B(\xi,\epsilon)) \ll \epsilon^\delta + \epsilon^{2\delta-\kappa_0}.$$

Clearly, this inequality holds for all $\xi \in \partial(\mathbb{H}^n)$, as the support of ν_o is equal to $\Lambda(\Gamma)$.

Now if $\partial(\Omega^{-1})$ is a piece-wise smooth subset of K, we can cover its ϵ-neighborhood by $O(\epsilon^{1-d_K})$ number of ϵ-balls, where d_K is the dimension of K.

Since for any $k \in K$,

$$\nu_o(B(k,\epsilon)) \ll \epsilon^{d_M} \cdot \nu_o(B(k(X_0^+),\epsilon)) \ll \epsilon^{\delta+d_M} + \epsilon^{2\delta-\kappa_0+d_M};$$

where $X_0 \in \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ is fixed by M and d_M is the dimension of M, we obtain that the ν_o measure of an ϵ-neighborhood of $\partial(\Omega^{-1})$ is at most of order

$$\epsilon^{\delta+d_M-d_K+1} + \epsilon^{2\delta-\kappa_0+d_M-d_K+1} = \epsilon^{\delta-n+2} + \epsilon^{2\delta-\kappa_0-n+2}.$$

Hence Ω is admissible if δ is bigger than both $(n-2)$ and $\frac{n-2+\kappa_0}{2}$. $\square$

The following strong wave front property of HAK decomposition is a crucial ingredient in proving an effective well-roundedness of a given family:

Lemma 7.9 (Strong wave front property)**.** [21, Theorem 4.1] *There exists $c > 1$ and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0$ and for any $g = ha_tk \in HA^+K$ with $t > 1$,*

$$gG_\epsilon \subset (hH_{c\epsilon})\,(a_tA_{c\epsilon})\,(kK_{c\epsilon})$$

where $H_{c\epsilon} = H \cap G_{c\epsilon}$ and $A_{c\epsilon}$ and $K_{c\epsilon}$ are defined similarly.

Proposition 7.10. *Let $\Omega \subset K$ be an admissible subset. Then the family $\{S_T(\Omega) : T \gg 1\}$ is effectively well-rounded and*

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(S_T(\Omega)) = \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|\cdot\nu_o(\Omega^{-1})}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}(T^\delta - 1).$$

Proof. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(S_T(\Omega)) &= \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\int_{t=0}^{\log T} e^{\delta t}dt \int_{k\in\Omega} d\nu_o(k^{-1}) \\ &= \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|\cdot\nu_o(\Omega^{-1})}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}(T^\delta - 1).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 7.9, there exists $c \geq 1$ such that for all $T > 1$ and $\epsilon > 0$

$$S_T(\Omega)G_\epsilon \subset [e]\{a_t : \log(1-c\epsilon) \leq t \leq \log(1+c\epsilon)T\}\Omega_{c\epsilon}^+$$

where $\Omega_{c_\epsilon}^+ = \Omega K_{c\epsilon}$ and $K_{c\epsilon}$ is a $c\epsilon$-neighborhood of e in K. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(S_T(\Omega)G_\epsilon) &\ll \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|\cdot\nu_o((\Omega_{c\epsilon}^+)^{-1})}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}(1+c\epsilon)^\delta T^\delta \\ &\ll \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|\cdot(1+O(\epsilon^p))\nu_o(\Omega^{-1})}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}(1+c\epsilon)^\delta T^\delta \\ &= (1+O(\epsilon^p))\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(S_T(\Omega)).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(\cap_{g\in G_\epsilon} S_T(\Omega)g) = (1+O(\epsilon^p))\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(S_T(\Omega)).$$

Hence the family $\{S_T(\Omega)\}$ is an effectively well-rounded family for Γ. $\square$

Therefore we deduce from Theorem 7.3:

Corollary 7.11. *Let $\Omega \subset K$ be an admissible subset. Then there exists $\eta_0 > 0$ (depending only on a uniform spectral gap for Γ and Γ_0) such that for any $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$*

$$\#([e]\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap S_T(\Omega)) = \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|\cdot\nu_o(\Omega^{-1})}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|\cdot\delta} T^\delta + O(T^{\delta-\eta_0}).$$

7.4.2. *Counting in norm-balls.* Let V be a finite dimensional vector space on which G acts linearly from the right and let $w_0 \in V$. We assume that $w_0\Gamma$ is discrete and that $H := G_{w_0}$ is either a symmetric subgroup or a horospherical subgroup. We let $A = \{a_t\}, K, M$ be as in section 5.4. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{N}$ be the log of the largest eigenvalue of a_1 on the $\mathbb{R}$-span of w_0G, and set

$$w_0^{\pm\lambda} := \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-\lambda t} w_0 a_{\pm t}.$$

Fixing a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on V, let $B_T := \{v \in w_0G : \|v\| < T\}$.

Proposition 7.12. *For any admissible $\Omega \subset K$, the family $\{B_T \cap w_0A^\pm\Omega\}$ is effectively well-rounded. In particular, $\{B_T\}$ is effectively well-rounded.*

We also compute that for some $0 < \eta < \delta/\lambda$,

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(B_T \cap w_0A^\pm\Omega) = \tfrac{|\mu_{H,\pm}^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} \cdot \int_\Omega \|w_0^{\pm\lambda}k\|^{-\delta/\lambda} d\nu_o(k^{-1}) \cdot T^{\delta/\lambda} + O(T^\eta).$$

Proof. By the definition of λ and w_0^λ, it follows that $w_0a_tk = e^{\lambda t}w_0^\lambda k + O(e^{\lambda_1 t})$ for some $\lambda_1 < \lambda$. Noting that $\|w_0a_tk\| \le T$ implies that $e^{\lambda t} = O(T)$ and $e^{\lambda_1 t} = O(T^{\lambda_1/\lambda})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega)\\
&= \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} \int_{k\in\Omega} \int_{\|w_0a_tk\|<T} e^{\delta t} dt d\nu_o(k^{-1})\\
&= \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} \int_{k\in\Omega} \int_{e^{\lambda t}\le\|w_0^\lambda k\|^{-1}T + O(T^{\lambda_1/\lambda})} e^{\delta t} dt d\nu_o(k^{-1})\\
&= \tfrac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|\cdot\delta} T^{\delta/\lambda} \int_{k\in\Omega} \|w_0^\lambda k\|^{-\delta/\lambda} d\nu_o(k^{-1}) + O(T^\eta)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\eta < \delta/\lambda$. The claim about $\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(B_T \cap w_0A^-\Omega)$ can be proven similarly. To show the effective well-roundedness, we first note that by Lemma 7.9, for some $c > 1$, we have

$$(B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega)G_\epsilon \subset B_{(1+c\epsilon)T} \cap w_0A^+\Omega_{c\epsilon}^+.$$

Therefore, using the admissibility of Ω, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}((B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega)G_\epsilon - (B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega))\\
&\ll \int_{k\in\Omega_{c\epsilon}^+-\Omega} \int_{\|w_0a_tk\|<(1+c\epsilon)T} e^{\delta t} dt d\nu_o(k^{-1}) + \int_{k\in\Omega_{c\epsilon}^+} \int_{T\le\|w_0a_tk\|<(1+c\epsilon)T} e^{\delta t} dt d\nu_o(k^{-1})\\
&\ll \epsilon^p \cdot T^{\delta/\lambda} + ((1+c\epsilon)T)^{\delta/\lambda} - T^{\delta/\lambda})\\
&\ll \epsilon^p T^{\delta/\lambda} \ll \epsilon^p \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can show that

$$\mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}((B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega) - \cap_{g\in G_\epsilon}(B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega)g) \ll \epsilon^p \mathcal{M}_{H\backslash G}(B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega).$$

This finishes the proof for the effective well-roundedness of $\{B_T \cap w_0A^+\Omega\}$. The claims about $\{B_T \cap w_0A^-\Omega\}$ can be shown in a similar fashion. □

Put

$$\Xi_{w_0}(\Gamma) := \begin{cases} \frac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\cdot\int_K \|w_0^\lambda k\|^{-\delta/\lambda} d\nu_o(k^{-1}) & \text{if } G = HA^+K \\ \sum \frac{|\mu_{H^\pm}^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\cdot\int_K \|w_0^{\pm\lambda} k\|^{-\delta/\lambda} d\nu_o(k^{-1}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We deduce the following from Proposition 7.12 and Theorem 7.3:

Corollary 7.13. (1) *For any admissible* $\Omega \subset K$, *there exists* $\eta_0 > 0$ *such that for any* $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$,

$$\#\{v \in w_0\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap w_0A^+\Omega : \|v\| < T\}$$
$$= \frac{|\mu_H^{\mathrm{PS}}|}{\delta\cdot[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|}\cdot\int_\Omega \|w_0^\lambda k\|^{-\delta/\lambda} d\nu_o(k^{-1}) T^{\delta/\lambda} + O(T^{\delta/\lambda-\eta_0}).$$

(2) *There exists* $\eta_0 > 0$ *(depending only on a uniform spectral gap for* Γ *and* Γ_0*) such that for any* $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$,

$$\#\{v \in w_0\Gamma_0\gamma_0 : \|v\| < T\} = \tfrac{1}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]}\Xi_{w_0}(\Gamma)T^{\delta/\lambda} + O(T^{\delta/\lambda-\eta_0}).$$

7.5. **The case when H is trivial.** In this subsection, we will prove the following theorem directly from the asymptotic of the matrix coefficient functions in Theorem 3.28.

Theorem 7.14. *Let* $\Gamma_0 < \Gamma$ *be a subgroup of finite index. If* $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset G\}$ *is effectively well-rounded with respect to* Γ *(see Def. 1.6), then there exists* $\eta_0 > 0$ *(depending only on a uniform spectral gap for* Γ *and* Γ_0*) such that for any* $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$

$$\#(\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T) = \tfrac{1}{[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]}\mathcal{M}_G(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\mathcal{M}_G(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1-\eta_0})$$

with the implied constant independent of Γ_0 *and* $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$.

Consider the following function on $\Gamma_0\backslash G \times \Gamma_0\backslash G$:

$$F_T(g,h) := \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_0} \chi_{\mathcal{B}_T}(g^{-1}\gamma h).$$

Observe that $F_T(e,\gamma_0) = \#(\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_T)$. Let $\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^{\pm}$ be as in the definition 1.6 and let $\phi^\epsilon \in C^\infty(G)$ and $\Phi^\epsilon \in C^\infty(\Gamma_0\backslash G)$ be as in the proof of Theorem 7.3. We then have

$$\langle F_{\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^-}, \Phi^\epsilon \otimes \Phi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}}\rangle \le F_T(e,\gamma_0) \le \langle F_{\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^+}, \Phi^\epsilon \otimes \Phi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}}\rangle.$$

Note that for $\Psi_1, \Psi_2 \in C_c(\Gamma_0\backslash G)$

$$\langle F_T, \Psi_1 \otimes \Psi_2\rangle_{\Gamma_0\backslash G\times\Gamma_0\backslash G} = \int_{g\in\mathcal{B}_T} \langle \Psi_1, g.\Psi_2\rangle_{L^2(\Gamma_0\backslash G)}\, dm^{\mathrm{Haar}}(g).$$

For a Borel subset $\mathcal{B}$ of G, consider a function $f_{\mathcal{B}}$ on $K \times K$ given by

$$f_{\mathcal{B}}(k_1, k_2) = \int_{a_t \in k_1^{-1}\mathcal{B}k_2^{-1} \cap A^+} e^{\delta t} dt,$$

and define a function on $G \times G$ by

$$((\psi^\epsilon \otimes \psi^\epsilon) * f_{\mathcal{B}})(g, h) = \int_{K \times K} \psi^\epsilon(gk_1)\psi^\epsilon(hk_2) f_{\mathcal{B}}(k_1, k_2) dk_1 dk_2.$$

We deduce by applying Theorem 1.1 and using the left Γ-invariance of the measures $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$ and $\tilde{m}_*^{\mathrm{BR}}$ that for some $\eta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\langle F_{\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^{\pm}}, \Phi^\epsilon \otimes \Phi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}} \rangle \\ &= \tfrac{1}{|m_{\Gamma_0}^{\mathrm{BMS}}|} (\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}} \otimes \tilde{m}_*^{\mathrm{BR}})((\psi^\epsilon \otimes \psi^\epsilon) * f_{\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^{\pm}}) + O(\max_{a_t \in \mathcal{B}_T} e^{(\delta - \eta)t} \epsilon^{q_\ell}).\end{aligned} \tag{7.15}$$

On the other hand, by a similar computation as in (7.4), we have

$$(\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}} \otimes \tilde{m}_*^{\mathrm{BR}})((\psi^\epsilon \otimes \psi^\epsilon) * f_{\mathcal{B}_{T,\epsilon}^{\pm}}) = (1 + O(\epsilon^p))\mathcal{M}_G(\mathcal{B}_T) \tag{7.16}$$

with $\mathcal{M}_G$ defined as in Definition 1.5. Since $|m_{\Gamma_0}^{\mathrm{BMS}}| = |m_{\Gamma}^{\mathrm{BMS}}| \cdot [\Gamma : \Gamma_0]$, putting (7.15) and (7.16) together, we get

$$F_T(e, \gamma_0) = \frac{1}{[\Gamma : \Gamma_0]} \mathcal{M}_G(\mathcal{B}_T) + O(\mathcal{M}_G(\mathcal{B}_T)^{1 - \eta_0})$$

for some $\eta_0 > 0$ depending only on a uniform spectral gap of Γ and Γ_0. This proves Theorem 7.14.

Corollary 7.17. *Let $\Omega_1, \Omega_2 \subset K$ be Borel subsets in K such that Ω_1^{-1} and Ω_2 are admissible in the sense of* (7.5). *Set $S_T(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) := \Omega_1\{a_t : 0 < t < \log T\}\Omega_2$. Then the family $\{S_T(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) : T \gg 1\}$ is effectively well-rounded with respect to Γ, and for some $\eta_0 > 0$,*

$$\#(\Gamma_0\gamma_0 \cap S_T(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)) = \frac{\nu_o(\Omega_1) \cdot \nu_o(\Omega_2^{-1})}{\delta \cdot |m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| \cdot [\Gamma : \Gamma_0]} T^\delta + O(T^{\delta - \eta_0})$$

with the implied constant independent of Γ_0 and $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$.

Using Proposition 7.9 for $H = K$, we can prove the effective well-roundedness of $\{S_T(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) : T \gg 1\}$ with respect to Γ in a similar fashion to the proof of Proposition 7.10. Hence Corollary 7.17 follows from Theorem 7.14; we refer to Lemma 7.6 and Proposition 7.7 for admissible subsets of K.

7.6. **Counting in bisectors of HA^+K coordinates.**

We state a counting result for bisectors in HA^+K coordinates.

Let $\tau_1 \in C_c^\infty(H)$ with its support being injective to $\Gamma\backslash G$ and $\tau_2 \in C^\infty(K)$, and define $\xi_T \in C^\infty(G)$ as follows: for $g = hak \in HA^+K$,

$$\xi_T(g) = \chi_{A_T^+}(a) \cdot \int_{H \cap M} \tau_1(hm)\tau_2(m^{-1}k) dm$$

where $\chi^+_{A_T}$ denotes the characteristic function of $A_T^+ = \{a_t : 0 < t < \log T\}$ for $T > 1$. Since if $hak = h'ak'$, then $h = h'm$ and $k = m^{-1}k'$ for some $m \in H \cap M$, the above function is well-defined.

Theorem 7.18. *Let $\Gamma_0 < \Gamma$ be a subgroup of finite index. There exists $\eta_0 > 0$ (depending only on a uniform spectral gap for Γ and Γ_0) and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma$,*

$$\sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_0} \xi_T(\gamma\gamma_0) = \frac{\tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)\cdot \nu_o^*(\tau_2)}{\delta \cdot |m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| \cdot [\Gamma : \Gamma_0]} T^{\delta} + O(T^{\delta-\eta_0}\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2))$$

where $\nu_o^*(\tau_2) := \int_k \tau_2(k) d\nu_o(k^{-1})$.

Proof. Now define a function F_T on $\Gamma_0\backslash G$ by

$$F_T(g) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_0} \xi_T(\gamma g).$$

For any $\psi \in C_c^\infty(G)$ and $\Psi \in C_c^\infty(\Gamma_0\backslash G)$ given by $\Psi(g) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_0}\psi(\gamma g)$, we have:

$$\langle F_T, \Psi\rangle_{\Gamma_0\backslash G} = \int_{k\in K} \tau_2(k) \int_{a_t\in A_T^+} \left(\int_{h\in H} \tau_1(h)\Psi(ha_tk)dh \right) \rho(t) dh dk dt.$$

As $\Psi \in C(\Gamma_0\backslash G)$, $\mathrm{supp}(\tau_1)$ injects to $\Gamma_0\backslash G$ and $H\cap\Gamma = H\cap\Gamma_0$, we have $\mu^{\mathrm{PS}}_{\Gamma_0,H}(\tau_1) = \tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)$ and $\int_{h\in H}\tau_1(h)\Psi(ha_tk)dh = \int_{h\in\Gamma_0\backslash\Gamma_0 H}\tau_1(h)\Psi(ha_tk)dh$. Therefore, by applying Theorem 5.13 to the inner integral, we obtain $\eta > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle F_T, \Psi\rangle_{\Gamma_0\backslash G} \\
&= \frac{\tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)}{|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}_{\Gamma_0}|} \int_{k\in K}\int_{a_t\in A_T^+} \tau_2(k) m^{\mathrm{BR}}_{\Gamma_0}(\Psi_k) e^{\delta t} dk dt + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)T^{\delta-\eta}) \\
&= \frac{\tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)\cdot \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi * \tau_2)}{\delta\cdot|m^{\mathrm{BMS}}|\cdot[\Gamma:\Gamma_0]} \cdot T^{\delta} + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi)T^{\delta-\eta}).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.19}$$

Let $\tau_i^{\epsilon,\pm}$ be ϵ-approximations of τ_i; $\tau_i^{\epsilon,\pm}(x)$ are respectively the supremum and the infimum of τ_i in the ϵ-neighborhood of x. Then for a suitable $\ell \geq 1$, $\tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1^{\epsilon,+} - \tau_1^{\epsilon,-}) = O(\epsilon\cdot\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1))$, and $\nu_o(\tau_2^{\epsilon,+} - \tau_2^{\epsilon,-}) = O(\epsilon\cdot\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2))$.

Let $F_T^{\epsilon,\pm}$ be a function on $\Gamma\backslash G$ defined similarly as F_T, with respect to $\xi_T^{\epsilon,\pm}(hak) = \chi_{A^+_{(1\pm\epsilon)T}}(a)\cdot\int_{H\cap M}\tau_1^{\epsilon,+}(hm)\tau_2^{\epsilon,+}(m^{-1}k)dm$.

As before, let $\psi^\epsilon \in C^\infty(G)$ be an ϵ smooth approximation of e: $0 \leq \psi^\epsilon \leq 1$, $\mathrm{supp}(\psi^\epsilon) \subset G_\epsilon$ and $\int \psi^\epsilon dg = 1$. Let $\Psi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}}$ be defined as in the subsection 7.2 with respect to ψ^ϵ. Lemma 7.9 implies that there exists $c > 0$ such that for all $g \in G_{c\epsilon}$,

$$F_T^{\epsilon,-}(\gamma_0 g) \leq F_T(\gamma_0) \leq F_T^{\epsilon,+}(\gamma_0 g)$$

and hence

$$\langle F_T^{\epsilon,-}, \Psi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}}\rangle \leq F_T(\gamma_0) \leq \langle F_T^{\epsilon,+}, \Psi^\epsilon_{\gamma_0^{-1}}\rangle. \tag{7.20}$$

By a similar computation as in the proof of Theorem 7.3 (cf. [46, proof of Prop. 7.5]), we have $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^\epsilon * \tau_2) = \nu_o^*(\tau_2) + O(\epsilon)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2)$.

Therefore, for q_ℓ given by $\mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi^\epsilon) = O(\epsilon^{-q_\ell})$, we deduce from (7.19) and (7.20) that, using the left Γ-invariance of the measure $\tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta \cdot |m^{\mathrm{BMS}}| \cdot [\Gamma : \Gamma_0] \cdot F_T(\gamma_0) \\
&= \tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1) \cdot \tilde{m}^{\mathrm{BR}}(\psi^\epsilon * \tau_2) \cdot T^\delta + O(\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1) S_\ell(\tau_2) \mathcal{S}_\ell(\psi^\epsilon) T^{\delta-\eta}) \\
&= \tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)\nu_o^*(\tau_2) T^\delta + O(\epsilon T^\delta + \epsilon^{-q_\ell} T^{\delta-\eta})\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2) \\
&= \tilde{\mu}_H^{\mathrm{PS}}(\tau_1)\nu_o^*(\tau_2) T^\delta + O(T^{\delta-\eta_0})\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_1)\mathcal{S}_\ell(\tau_2)
\end{aligned}$$

for some $\eta_0 > 0$, by taking ϵ to be a suitable power of T^{-1}. □

Corollary 7.17 as well as its analogues in HAK decompositions can also be deduced directly from Theorem 7.18.

8. AFFINE SIEVE

In this final section, we prove Theorems 1.10 and 1.11. We begin by recalling the combinatorial sieve (see [23, Theorem 7.4]).

Let $\mathsf{A} = \{a_n\}$ be a sequence of non-negative numbers and let B be a finite set of primes. For $z > 1$, let P be the product of primes $P = \prod_{p \notin B, p < z} p$. We set

$$S(\mathsf{A}, P) := \sum_{(n,P)=1} a_n.$$

To estimate $S(\mathsf{A}, P)$, we need to understand how A is distributed along arithmetic progressions. For d square-free, define

$$\mathsf{A}_d := \{a_n \in \mathsf{A} : n \equiv 0(d)\}$$

and set $|\mathsf{A}_d| := \sum_{n \equiv 0(d)} a_n$.

We will use the following combinatorial sieve:

Theorem 8.1. (A_1) *For d square-free with no factors in B, suppose that*

$$|\mathsf{A}_d| = g(d)\mathcal{X} + r_d(\mathsf{A})$$

where g is a function on square-free integers with $0 \le g(p) < 1$, g is multiplicative outside B, i.e., $g(d_1 d_2) = g(d_1)g(d_2)$ if d_1 and d_2 are square-free integers with $(d_1, d_2) = 1$ and $(d_1 d_2, B) = 1$, and for some $c_1 > 0$, $g(p) < 1 - 1/c_1$ for all prime $p \notin B$.;

(A_2) *A has level distribution $D(\mathcal{X})$, in the sense that for some $\epsilon > 0$ and $C_\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{d<D} |r_d(\mathsf{A})| \le C_\epsilon \mathcal{X}^{1-\epsilon}.$$

(A_3) *A has sieve dimension r in the sense that there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for all $2 \le w \le z$,*

$$-c \le \sum_{(p,B)=1, w \le p \le z} g(p) \log p - t \log \frac{z}{w} \le c.$$

Then for $s > 9r$, $z = D^{1/s}$ and $\mathcal{X}$ large enough,

$$S(\mathsf{A}, P) \asymp \frac{\mathcal{X}}{(\log \mathcal{X})^r}.$$

Let $\mathbf{G}$, G $V = \mathbb{C}^m$, Γ, $w_0 \in V(\mathbb{Z})$, etc., be as in Theorem 1.10. We consider the spin cover $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} \to \mathbf{G}$. Noting that the image of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbb{R})$ is precisely $G = \mathbf{G}(\mathbb{R})^\circ$, we replace Γ by its preimage under the spin cover. This does not affect the orbit $w_0\Gamma$ and all our counting statements hold equally. Set $W := w_0\mathbf{G}$ (resp. $w_0\mathbf{G} \cup \{0\}$) if $w_0\mathbf{G}$ (resp. $w_0\mathbf{G} \cup \{0\}$) is Zariski closed,

Let $F \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \cdots, x_m]$ be a polynomial such that $F = F_1 \cdots F_r$ where $F_i \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \cdots, x_m]$ are all irreducible polynomials and $\gcd\{F(x) : x \in w_0\Gamma\} = 1$.

Let $\{\mathcal{B}_T \subset W\}$ be an effectively well-rounded family of subsets with respect to Γ. Set $\mathcal{O} := w_0\Gamma$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $T > 1$, we also set

$$a_n(T) := \#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : F(x) = n\};$$

$$\Gamma_{w_0}(d) := \{\gamma \in \Gamma : w_0\gamma \equiv w_0\ (d)\};$$

$$|\mathsf{A}(T)| := \sum_n a_n(T) = \#\mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T;$$

$$|\mathsf{A}_d(T)| := \sum_{n \equiv 0(d)} a_n(T) = \#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : F(x) \equiv 0\ (d)\}.$$

Denote by Γ_d the image of Γ under the reduction map $\tilde{\mathbf{G}} \to \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})$ and set $\mathcal{O}_d$ to be the orbit of w_0 in $(\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^m$ under Γ_d; so $\#\mathcal{O}_d = [\Gamma : \Gamma_{w_0}(d)]$. We also set

$$\mathcal{O}_F(d) := \{x \in \mathcal{O}_d : F(x) \equiv 0\ \ (d)\}.$$

Corollary 8.2. *Put $\mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T) = \mathcal{X}$. There exist $\eta_0 > 0$ and a finite set S of primes such that for any square-free integer d with no factors in S, we have*

$$|\mathsf{A}_d(T)| = g(d)\mathcal{X} + r_d(\mathsf{A})$$

where $g(d) = \frac{\#\mathcal{O}_F(d)}{\#\mathcal{O}_d}$ and $r_d(\mathsf{A}) = \#\mathcal{O}_F(d) \cdot O(\mathcal{X}^{1-\eta_0})$.

Proof. Note that by [51] and by the transfer property obtained in [5], the family $\{\Gamma_{w_0}(d)\}$ has a uniform spectral gap where d runs over all square-free integers with no small prime factors. Hence applying Theorem 1.7 to $\#(w_0\Gamma_{w_0}(d)\gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T)$, we have that there exist a finite set of primes S and $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such that for any square-free integer d with no factors in S,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathsf{A}_d(T)| &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{w_0}(d)\backslash\Gamma, F(w_0\gamma) \equiv 0(d)} \#(w_0\Gamma_{w_0}(d)\gamma \cap \mathcal{B}_T) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{w_0}(d)\backslash\Gamma, F(w_0\gamma) \equiv 0(d)} \left(\tfrac{1}{[\Gamma : \Gamma_{w_0}(d)]}\mathcal{X} + O(\mathcal{X}^{1-\epsilon_0}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\#\mathcal{O}_F(d) = \#\{\gamma \in \Gamma_{w_0}(d)\backslash\Gamma, F(w_0\gamma) \equiv 0\ \ (d)\}$, the claim follows. ☐

In the following we verify the sieve axioms (A_1), (A_2) and (A_3) in this set-up. This step is very similar to [44, sec. 4] as we use the same combinatorial sieve and the only difference is that we don't assume that the stabilizer of w_0 is trivial and we use the variable $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T)$ instead of T. This is needed for us, as we are working with very general sets $\mathcal{B}_T$; however if $\mathcal{M}_{w_0G}(\mathcal{B}_T) \asymp T^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$, we could also use T as the variable.

Since $\delta > (n-1)/2$, Γ is Zariski dense in $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$. Hence using a theorem of Matthews, Vaserstein and Weisfeiler [42], and enlarging S if necessary, the diagonal embedding of Γ is dense in $\prod_{p\notin S} \tilde{\mathbf{G}}(\mathbb{F}_p)$. The multiplicative property of g on square-free integers with no factors in S, as stated in (A_1), follows from this (see [44, proof of Prop. 4.1]).

Letting $W_j = \{x \in W : F_j(x) = 0\}$ for $1 \le j \le r$, W_j is an absolutely irreducible affine variety over $\mathbb{Q}$ of dimension $\dim(W) - 1$ and hence by Noether's theorem, W_j is absolutely irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_p$ for all $p \notin S$, by enlarging S if necessary. We may also assume that $W(\mathbb{F}_p) = w_0\mathbf{G}(\mathbb{F}_p)$ (up to $\{0\}$) for all $p \notin S$ by Lang's theorem [34]. Using Lang-Weil estimates [35] on $W(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $\#W_j(\mathbb{F}_p)$, we obtain that for $p \notin S$,

$$\#\mathcal{O}_F(p) = r \cdot p^{\dim(W)-1} + O(p^{\dim W - 3/2}) \text{ and } \#\mathcal{O}_p = p^{\dim W} + O(p^{\dim W - 1/2}).$$

Hence $g(p) = r \cdot p^{-1} + O(p^{-3/2})$ for all $p \notin S$. This implies (A_3) (cf. [43, Thm 2.7]), as well as the last claim of (A_1).

Moreover it implies together with Corollary 8.2 that

$$r(\mathsf{A}, d) \ll d^{\dim W - 1} \mathcal{X}^{1-\eta_0}.$$

Hence for $D \le \mathcal{X}^{\eta_0/(2\dim W)}$ and $\epsilon_0 = \eta_0/2$, we deduce

$$\sum_{d \le D} r(\mathsf{A}, d) \ll D^{\dim W} \mathcal{X}^{1-\eta_0} \le \mathcal{X}^{1-\epsilon_0},$$

providing (A_2). Therefore for any $z = D^{1/s} \le \mathcal{X}^{\eta_0/(2s\dim W)}$ and $s > 9r$, and for all large $\mathcal{X}$, we have

$$S(\mathsf{A}, P) \asymp \frac{\mathcal{X}}{(\log \mathcal{X})^r}. \tag{8.3}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Using arguments in the proof of Corollary 8.2, we first observe (cf. [44, Lem. 4.3]) that there exists $\eta > 0$ such that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : F_j(x) = k\} \ll \mathcal{X}^{1-\eta}.$$

Fixing $0 < \epsilon_1 < \eta$, it implies that

$$\#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : |F_j(x)| \le \mathcal{X}^{\epsilon_1}\} \ll \mathcal{X}^{1-\eta+\epsilon_1}. \tag{8.4}$$

Now

$$\#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : \text{all } F_j(x) \text{ prime}\} \le \sum_{j=1}^{r} \#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : |F_j(x)| \le \mathcal{X}^{\epsilon_1}\}$$

$$+ \#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : |F_j(x)| \ge \mathcal{X}^{\epsilon_1} \text{ for all } 1 \le j \le r \text{ and all } F_j(x) \text{ prime}\}.$$

Now for $z \le \mathcal{X}^{\eta_0/(2s\dim W)}$ such that $P = \prod_{p<z} p \ll \mathcal{X}^{\epsilon_1}$, we have

$$\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : |F_j(x)| \ge \mathcal{X}^{\epsilon_1} \text{ for all } 1 \le j \le r \text{ and } \text{ all } F_j(x) \text{ prime}\} \\ \subset \{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : (F_j(x), P) = 1\}$$

and the cardinality of the latter set is $S(\mathsf{A}, P)$ according to our definition of a_n's.

Therefore, we obtain the desired upper bound:

$$\#\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : \text{all } F_j(x) \text{ prime}\} \ll \mathcal{X}^{1-\eta+\epsilon_1} + \frac{\mathcal{X}}{(\log \mathcal{X})^r} \ll \frac{\mathcal{X}}{(\log \mathcal{X})^r}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.11. By the assumption, for some $\beta > 0$,

$$\max_{x \in \mathcal{B}_T} \|x\| \ll \mathcal{M}_{w_0 G}(\mathcal{B}_T)^\beta = \mathcal{X}^\beta. \tag{8.5}$$

Note that all prime factors of $F(x)$ has to be at least the size of z if $(F(x), P) = 1$ and $|F(x)| \ll \mathcal{X}^{\beta \deg(F)}$ for all $x \in \mathcal{B}_T$. Therefore for $z = \mathcal{X}^{\eta_0/(2s\dim W)}$ and $P = \prod_{p<z, p\notin S} p$, $R = \frac{\beta \cdot \deg(F) 2s \dim W}{\eta_0}$, we have

$$\{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : (F(x), P) = 1\} \\ \subset \{x \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{B}_T : F(x) \text{ has at most } R \text{ prime factors}\}.$$

Since the cardinality of the former set is $S(\mathsf{A}, P)$, we get the desired lower bound $\frac{\mathcal{X}}{(\log \mathcal{X})^r}$ from (8.3).

Remark 8.6. When Γ is an arithmetic subgroup of a simply connected semisimple algebraic $\mathbb{Q}$-group G, and H is a symmetric subgroup, the analogue of Theorem 1.7 has been obtained in [3], assuming that $H \cap \Gamma$ is a lattice in H. Strictly speaking, [3, Theorem 1.3] is stated only for a fixed group Γ; however it is clear from its proof that the statement also holds uniformly over its congruence subgroups with the correct main term, as in Theorem 1.7. Based on this, one can use the combinatorial sieve 8.1 to obtain analogues of Theorems 1.10 and 1.11, as it was done for a group variety in [44]. Theorem 1.11 on lower bound for Γ arithmetic was obtained in [19] further assuming that $H \cap \Gamma$ is co-compact in H.

References

[1] T. Aubin. Nonlinear analysis on manifolds. *GM 252 Springer*, 1982

[2] Martine Babillot. On the mixing property for hyperbolic systems. *Israel J. Math.*, 129:61–76, 2002.

[3] Yves Benoist and Hee Oh. Effective equidistribution of S-integral points on symmetric varieties. *To appear in Annales de L'Institut Fourier*, arXive 0706.1621

[4] Jean Bourgain, Alex Gamburd, and Peter Sarnak. Generalization of Selberg's 3/16 theorem and Affine sieve. *Acta Math.* 207, (2011) 255-290

[5] Jean Bourgain, Alex Gamburd, and Peter Sarnak. Affine linear sieve, expanders, and sum-product. *Inventiones* 179, (2010) 559-644

[6] Jean Bourgain, Alex Kontorovich, and Peter Sarnak. Sector estimates for Hyperbolic isometries. *GAFA* 20, 1175–1200, 2010.

[7] Jean Bourgain and Alex Kontorovich. On representations of integers in thin subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ *GAFA* 20, 1144–1274, 2010.

[8] Jean Bourgain and Alex Kontorovich. On the strong density conjecture for integral Apollonian gaskets *Preprint* arXiv:1205.4416

[9] B. H. Bowditch. Geometrical finiteness for hyperbolic groups. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 113(2):245–317, 1993.

[10] Rufus Bowen. Periodic points and measures for Axiom A diffeomorphisms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 154:377–397, 1971.

[11] Marc Burger. Horocycle flow on geometrically finite surfaces. *Duke Math. J.*, 61(3):779–803, 1990.

[12] F. Dal'bo. Topologie du feuilletage fortement stable. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 50(3):981–993, 2000.

[13] Dmitry Dolgopyat. On decay of correlations in Anosov flows. *Ann. Math*, 147:357–390, 1998

[14] W. Duke, Z. Rudnick, and P. Sarnak. Density of integer points on affine homogeneous varieties. *Duke Math. J.*, 71(1):143–179, 1993.

[15] Alex Eskin and C. T. McMullen. Mixing, counting, and equidistribution in Lie groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 71(1):181–209, 1993.

[16] L. Flaminio and R. Spatzier. Geometrically finite groups, Patterson-Sullivan measures and Ratner's theorem. *Inventiones*, 99, 601-626 (1990)

[17] Alex Gamburd. On the spectral gap for infinite index congruence subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ *Israel J. Math*, 127 (2002), 157-200

[18] Alex Gorodnik and Amos Nevo. The ergodic theory of Lattice subgroups *Annals of Math Studies.* Vol 172, 2009

[19] Alex Gorodnik and Amos Nevo. Lifting, Restricting and Sifting integral points on affine homogeneous varieties. *Preprint*

[20] Alex Gorodnik and Hee Oh. Orbits of discrete subgroups on a symmetric space and the Furstenberg boundary. *Duke Math. J.*, 139(3):483–525, 2007.

[21] Alex Gorodnik, Hee Oh and Nimish Shah. Strong wavefront lemma and counting lattice points in sectors. *Israel J. Math*, 176:419–444, 2010.

[22] Roger Howe and Calvin Moore. Asymptotic properties of unitary representations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 72–96, 1979.

[23] H. Halberstam and H. Richert Sieve methods. *A.P* (1974) 167–242

[24] Henryk Iwaniec and Emmanuel Kowalski. *Analytic number theory*, volume 53 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.

[25] D. Y. Kleinbock and G. A. Margulis. Bounded orbits of nonquasiunipotent flows on homogeneous spaces. In *Sinaĭ's Moscow Seminar on Dynamical Systems*, volume 171 of *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser. 2*, pages 141–172. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996.

[26] Inkang Kim. Counting, Mixing and Equidistribution of horospheres in geometrically finite rank one locally symmetric manifolds. *Preprint*, arXiv:1103.5003

[27] A. Knapp. Representation theory of semisimple Lie groups. *Princeton University press.*

[28] Alex Kontorovich. The hyperbolic lattice point count in infinite volume with applications to sieves. *Duke Math. J.*, 149(1):1–36, 2009.

[29] Alex Kontorovich and Hee Oh. Almost prime Pythagorean triples in thin orbits. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 667, 89–131, 2012.

[30] Alex Kontorovich and Hee Oh. Apollonian circle packings and closed horospheres on hyperbolic 3-manifolds. *Journal of AMS*, 603–648, 2011.

[31] Bertram Kostant. On the existence and irreducibility of certain series of representations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc*, Vol 75. 627–642, 1969.

[32] E. Kowalski. Sieve in expansion *Séminaire Bourbaki*

[33] E. Kowlaski. Sieve in discrete groups, especially sparse. *Preprint.*

[34] S. Lang Algebraic groups over finite fields *American J. Math* 78 (1956) 555-563

[35] S. Lang and A. Weil Number of points of varieties in finite fields *American J. Math* 76 (1954) 819-827

[36] Peter D. Lax and Ralph S. Phillips. The asymptotic distribution of lattice points in Euclidean and non-Euclidean spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 46(3):280–350, 1982.

[37] Min Lee and Hee Oh. Effective count for Apollonian circle packings and closed horospheres. *To appear in GAFA.* arXiv:1202.1067

[38] J. Liu and P. Sarnak. Integral points on quadrics in three variables whose coordinates have few prime factors. *Israel J. Math* 178 (2010) 393-426

[39] M. Magee. Quantitative spectral gap for thin groups of hyperbolic isometries *Preprint.* arXiv:1112.2004

[40] F. Maucourant. Homogeneous asymptotic limits of Haar measures of semisimple Lie groups and their lattices. *Duke Math. J.*. vol 136 (2) 1007, 357–399

[41] Gregory Margulis. On some aspects of theory of Anosov systems. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. With a survey by Richard Sharp: Periodic orbits of hyperbolic flows, Translated from the Russian by Valentina Vladimirovna Szulikowska.

[42] C. Matthews, L. Vaserstein and B. Weisfeiler Congruence properties of Zariski dense subgroups *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 48, 1984, 514-532

[43] H. Montgomery and R. Vaughan Multiplicatve number theory. I. Classical theory *Camb. Studies in Advanced Math.* 97, Camb, Unive. Press. 2007

[44] Amos Nevo and Peter Sarnak. Prime and Almost prime integral points on principal homogeneous spaces. *Acta Math*, 205 (2010), 361–402

[45] Hee Oh. Harmonic analysis, Ergodic theory and Counting for thin groups. *preprint.*

[46] Hee Oh and Nimish Shah. Counting and Equidistribution for orbits of geometrically finite hyperbolic groups. *To appear in Journal of AMS.* arXiv:1001.2096

[47] Hee Oh and Nimish Shah. The asymptotic distribution of circles in the orbits of Kleinian groups. *Inventiones*, Vol 187, 1–35, 2012

[48] S.J. Patterson. The limit set of a Fuchsian group. *Acta Mathematica*, 136:241–273, 1976.

[49] Thomas Roblin. Ergodicité et équidistribution en courbure négative. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (95):vi+96, 2003.

[50] A. Salehi Golsefidy and P. Sarnak. Affine Sieve. *preprint.* arXiv:1109.6432

[51] A. Salehi Golsefidy and P. Varjú. Expansion in perfect groups. *preprint.* arXiv:1108.4900

[52] Barbara Schapira. Equidistribution of the horocycles of a geometrically finite surface. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, (40):2447–2471, 2005.

[53] Yehuda Shalom. Rigidity, unitary representations of semisimple groups, and fundamental groups of manifolds with rank one transformation group. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 152(1):113–182, 2000.

[54] L. Stoyanov. Spectra of Ruelle transfer operators for axiom A flows. *Nonlinearity*, 24 (2011), 1089–1120

[55] Dennis Sullivan. The density at infinity of a discrete group of hyperbolic motions. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (50):171–202, 1979.

[56] Dennis Sullivan. Entropy, Hausdorff measures old and new, and limit sets of geometrically finite Kleinian groups. *Acta Math.*, 153(3-4):259–277, 1984.

[57] Ilya Vinogradov. Effective bisector estimate with applications to Apollonian circle packings. preprint, arXiv:1204.5498

[58] Garth Warner. Harmonic Analysis on semisimple Lie groups I. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (95):vi+96, 2003.

[59] Garth Warner. Harmonic Analysis on semisimple Lie groups II. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (95):vi+96, 2003.

Department of Mathematics, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78750
E-mail address: `amir@math.utexas.edu`

Mathematics department, Brown university, Providence, RI 02912 and Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul, Korea
E-mail address: `heeoh@math.brown.edu`